

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES.

VOL. XXII, No. 7.

JULY 1942

THE NATURE OF THE PASTORAL VOCATION

THE pastoral vocation poses a dilemma between prayer and outward activity, between the labouring at our own sanctification and at that of others. It is not enough to deny the dilemma with some such comfortable tag as *laborare est orare*, because we all know that often our work is far from being a prayer, that in much of the day's occupation there has been little or no lifting of the mind and heart to God. Nor is it enough to resolve the dilemma by dividing life into two watertight compartments, one for prayer and one for our pastoral labours. That would reduce the problem to a question of proportion, of how much time in the day should be devoted to mental and vocal prayer. Such a question is not easily answered. But far harder is the question whether anything at all should be allowed to interfere with this minimum allowance of prayer; and if so, on what principle. An urgent sick call will make everyone leave his office or meditation or thanksgiving. This establishes that there are exceptions to the most rigid rule of life. Unfortunately it does not establish what those exceptions are.

Everyone admits that if a priest's activity is to be fruitful in grace, he must be a man of prayer. Everyone also admits that much activity, even pastoral activity, has a deadening effect on the life of prayer. No office on earth can be more supernatural than that of the Pope; yet, when Saint Gregory was faced with the burdens of the Papacy, he described how he was "oppressed to suffocation with business . . . driven from the face of the Lord into the exile of employment . . . separated almost from the love of God" (Epp. i, 26, 6, 30). No one can lightly dismiss the warning of the seed that "fell among thorns: and the thorns grew up and choked them" (Matt. xiii, 7). The priest is always being told that he must be in the world but not of it; and his natural question is to ask how this may be done. What activities are priestly and what are not? How large a place should friendship take in his life? Should there be any difference in his attitude to mortification from that of a religious, and if so, what? Also, why?

The only possible answer to these questions, and a score more like them, lies in a clear understanding of the nature of the pastoral vocation. It may sound impertinent to suggest the need of clarification on such a subject: yet I am convinced that many difficulties arise in practice for lack of an integrated, comprehensive view of all that is included in the vocation of a secular priest. He has learnt, for instance, that his first duty is to be holy. All that can be done in the seminary has been done to make him a man of character dedicated to the service of God, one capable of

saying "No" to himself for the sake of better obedience to Christ. But, so far, there is nothing in this ideal to differentiate the secular priest from any other kind of priest: or, for that matter, from the layman. It is the duty of every Christian to be perfect as His heavenly Father is perfect (Matt. v, 48).

The essential difference between the pastoral vocation and the religious is none other than this difficult business of apostolic activity among men. Priests in religious orders may be most zealous and active apostles; but it is not this which makes them religious. Whereas the pastoral vocation is essentially an active vocation: it is pastoral in that it looks after the sheep of the fold, and apostolic in that it goes in search of the sheep that are lost. The words of its commission demand external activity: "*Going* therefore, *teach* ye all nations" (Matt. xxviii, 19). And it is a most noble vocation. "How beautiful are the *feet* of him that bringeth good tidings, and that preacheth peace: of him that showeth forth good, that preacheth salvation, that saith to Sion: Thy God shall reign" (Is. lii, 7). Prayer and good example are not enough to fulfil such a commission. Saint Paul picks up this very text when he would describe the need of an apostolic ministry. "How shall they believe him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear, without a preacher? And how shall they preach unless they be sent, as it is written: How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, of them that bring glad tidings of good things" (Rom. x, 14, 15).

And, most emphatically, we have been sent. Saint Mark is even more explicit than Saint Matthew: "And he said to them: Go ye into the whole world and preach the gospel to every creature. . . . And they going forth preached everywhere: the Lord working withal, and confirming the words with signs that followed" (Mark xvi, 15, 20).

So, activity among men is an essential element of our vocation, and any view of that vocation which does not give it its due place is an inadequate view. Activity is as much part of our calling as are prayer and the Mass; not so important a part, in the sense that its efficacy largely depends on these, but as integral a part. Without apostolic activity among men, our lives will not conform to the ideals of the pastoral vocation. Therefore we need an understanding of that vocation which will define the proper place of activity within its framework, and so help to solve all the problems set by the relationship between prayer and action, between aiming at my personal holiness and at the holiness of others.

The classic text for a complete understanding of the priestly vocation is, of course: "Every high-priest, taken from among men, is ordained for men, in the things that appertain to God, that he may offer up gifts and sacrifices for sins" (Heb. v, 1). Each member of that sentence, here placed between commas, will repay pondering. But what I want to stress at the moment is the phrase, *ordained for men*: not primarily for our own sanctification, still less for any human ambition, but to be of service to

others : and that in the highest sphere of all, *in the things that appertain to God*. Here is the bloom of charity. It combines the two great commandments, to love God with all one's being, and one's neighbour as oneself for God's sake. It is most important that we should realize that no one is ordained priest simply for his own greater perfection, but principally for the benefit of the body of the faithful. Christ, the great High-Priest, was already perfect before He undertook the work of our redemption ; He became a priest for our sakes. And so it must always be : we too become priests for the sake of others. Nor is charity enough. To be a priest is to share Christ's priesthood, and to that we must be called and commissioned. "Neither doth any man take the honour to himself, but he that is called by God" (Heb. v, 4). If it is a question of individual perfection, we know that this must always be sought in obedience to God's will : God's will in each man's case is his vocation ; therefore perfection is to be sought in the fulfilment of one's vocation. The syllogism is complete. But the pastoral vocation looks *ad extra*. If its motive is the love of God, its material is the souls of other men. So that, for anyone called to the pastoral life, perfection must be sought in apostolic work among men.

All this may seem to be labouring the obvious, but its application immediately traces out a rule of life and provides a standard of weights and measures which settles the value of various courses offered to us by circumstances. It settles, for instance, the ideal of the pastoral vocation, which Saint Paul described when he said : "I became all things to all men, that I might save all" (Cor. ix, 22). That ideal means that in everything we do, literally everything, we have as our purpose the greater glory of God through the good of our neighbour's soul. Our duty is to be at the beck and call of others for the sake of their salvation. And if that is our duty, it is also our means of sanctification ; it will include prayer and mortification and everything else that can be demanded of us in our progress towards perfection and closer union with God.

This, apparently extreme, statement will be seen to be true if we revert to the principle that our personal sanctification is to be pursued in and through our pastoral vocation. *Laborare est orare* can be justified if, and only if, we turn our work into prayer. And that is done by making its motive the glory of God sought in the salvation of men. Zeal for souls will transform everything into prayer : we shall go about with mind and heart raised to God, we shall "pray without ceasing" (1 Thess. v, 17). Zeal for the extension of God's kingdom will deliver us from the heresy of works by teaching us the true doctrine of works ; i.e. by putting God into our activity it will prevent that activity from becoming merely external. But activity there must be.

In practice, to be constantly faithful to such a motive demands supernatural sight, which is not natural sight. To be zealous for the conversion of the bore, the ingrate, the self-centred, the mean, the unclean, the opinionated, the common, the liar, the sadist ; to sacrifice time, thought,

trouble and dignity for the wooing of such unattractive personalities, just because God loves them, is to possess a penetration of vision and a scale of values which do not come naturally. And therefore the need of unremitting effort and of prayer. To judge and to act on the supernatural plane are impossible without abundance of grace. We need to feel that need; and if we feel it, we cannot escape the urge to pray hard for grace. Otherwise we shall soon become externalized, professional not pastoral, practical not apostolic. The handling of sacred things will make them familiar, in the worst sense of the word. Our conduct will be dictated by our likes and our dislikes, and we shall have ceased to put Christ's interests before our own. The choice offered to us at every turn of the day is a call to constant mortification, to the sacrifice of comfort, of self-will, of leisure—all because our Lord wants us to do something that does not attract us for someone who does not attract us either. The most nagging mortification we can suffer is an endless succession of interruptions, from morning to night; for ever putting down what we are doing, breaking our train of thought, to answer the bell and attend to quite trivial wants for a comparative stranger: pension papers, baptism certificates, requests for small charity and the like. But therein lies the holiness, and the heroism, of the pastoral life: you cannot have one without the other. To give oneself without reserve to the service of others for God's sake is heroic. It was this which made a great saint of the *Curé de Ars*; and it is a faithful reproduction of our Lord's own life, "who went about doing good, and healing all who were oppressed by the devil, for God was with him" (Acts x, 38). The heroism, of course, lies not in acting so for one day or two or three, but in keeping it up for a lifetime, summoning up new energy to do the same old things. When Saint Paul exhorted the Thessalonians: "Be not weary in well-doing" (2 Thess. iii, 13), he was asking perhaps the hardest thing of human nature.

And all this God-dictated activity is made perfect when we realize that its very best works are valueless unless placed in our Lord's hands at Mass to be laid by Him before the throne of His Father. Then, at last, one may speak of "a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ" (1 Peter ii, 5) which only agrees with Saint Paul's description: "Therefore I endure all things for the sake of the elect that they also may obtain that salvation which is in Christ Jesus" (2 Tim. ii, 10).

With this outlook, which sanctifies us through activity without losing sanctity in activity, we can readily settle whatever practical problems trouble us. There is no need for a lot of rules. Instead, we have something much more valuable, an attitude of mind which converts circumstances to the service of God, something which is elastic and adaptable. To see God in my neighbour is already a spiritual gift of supreme excellence and some rarity. But such is the priestly attitude of mind, and it is an attitude that will turn everything to God's advantage and allow the devil a monopoly of nothing except sin. Every piece of knowledge we

possess can be pressed into God's service to make us all things to all men : knowledge of art, of literature, of music, of science, of history, of sport, of the etymology of the names of public houses—none of it should be despised. It can all help to establish contact with people whom otherwise we could not reach. And when we have established contact, our ruling motive will drive us to lead them on to the Faith, inch by inch if need be, laying patient siege to their souls, until another lover of Christ is born into the world.

As for the problem of how much prayer we should make in the day, it will be seen that this is a matter, not only of isolated acts, but also of a habit of mind. In relation to pastoral work, prayer can be looked on as a power-house or as a life : an integrated vision of the secular priesthood will look upon it as both. In the morning meditation, for instance, a priest can win the grace from God to carry him through the day's duties : visiting, the confessional, preaching, taking converts and the rest. But it is an enormous gain to link the two even more closely than that, action not only following from prayer but completing prayer by itself becoming prayer. Just as faith without works is dead, so formal prayer without action is incomplete, and action for the secular priest is pastoral and apostolic activity. Our vocation calls us to supernatural activity, that is to activity inspired and accompanied by prayer. It is already much to walk in the strength of that food unto the mountain of God ; but by striving might and main always to have God as our companion, the very walking will itself become a prayer, a state as well as an action in union with God. Then our priestly activity does not just issue from our prayer, but adds to that prayer, continues it, completes it. So it is obvious that we must try to make our intention in what we do formal rather than virtual. But the whole background of our minds, if we comprehend our vocation, will help us to do this. It is a grace, but a grace on which we can confidently count, *gratia status*. To remind oneself, when knocking on the door of a parishioner, that one is the ambassador of Christ, is formally to put the pastoral motive into what one says and does ; consciously to lean on the grace of one's Mass, of one's Office and rosary, is to bind the whole of one's life into a real unity that is based on one's vocation. This is, in truth, the *vita mixta*, of which Saint Thomas speaks so highly. And once we have achieved this, even remotely, there will be little difficulty about how long we should spend upon our knees. Certain things are laid down for us by positive legislation ; and the rest will grow organically from so sound a root.

Much the same thing is true of mortification. To follow our vocation generously is already to live a life of great penance. Other practices can profitably be added, if they do not unfit us for the work whereto we are called. That is the first duty of all, and nothing, not even mortification, must be allowed to interfere with it. Again, worldliness is hardly a danger when we have the priestly outlook, because worldliness is not the enjoying of this world's good things, but the judging of human judgements by

standards which do not apply in God's eyes. Now, the whole aim of the mental attitude I have tried to describe is to look at everything with God's eyes; which means that we are practising unworldliness all the time. In the same way we can decide about friendships, our recreations, our standard of comfort, the place we give to social engagements and so on. The criterion is always the same: is the course we propose to follow calculated, directly or indirectly, to bring souls to Christ? That is the yard-stick by which we measure everything. It is at once the sharpest of weapons and the surest of shields.

For to live in the world at all is a risky business; yet we are called to take those risks. But there is no need to fear, whatever the consciousness of our own weakness, provided we take them in pursuit of God's interests. We are both safe and effective if we can sincerely ask of our natural doubts: "Did you not know that I must be about my Father's business?" (Luke ii, 49). It is only when we run risks for the sake of our own pleasure or curiosity or pride that danger threatens. And then indeed we have cause to fear. But a complete view of the pastoral vocation, acted upon with consistency, is a panacea both for perplexities and for dread. Christ "hath made us a kingdom, and priests to God, and his Father; to him be glory and empire for ever and ever. Amen" (Apoc. i, 6).

RICHARD L. SMITH.

CHRISTIAN CO-OPERATION

THE "Joint Statement on Co-operation", issued by the Joint Committee of "Religion and Life" and the "Sword of the Spirit", was published in the secular and religious press, 29 May, 1942. It is the most important document which has been issued since the joint letter, signed by the religious leaders in this country, appeared in *The Times* of 21 December, 1940, and its appearance bears testimony to the patience, good will and earnestness which have inspired all parties during the long negotiations which preceded it. Meanwhile an estimate of its authority may be attempted.

The Bishop of London, chairman of the Joint Committee, described it as follows in his broadcast address, 28 May, 1942, the text of which may be seen in the "Sword of the Spirit" bulletin, 4 June, 1942. "It is not an official pronouncement of any of the Churches concerned, but it has the goodwill of a joint Anglican and Free Church Commission and of the Roman Catholic Church, and it has today been warmly commended by the

Archbishop of Canterbury, as Chairman of the Commission of the Churches, and by Cardinal Hinsley, as President of the *Sword of the Spirit*." The *Universe*, 5 June, 1942, reporting the reception in London at which the text was issued, noted that "Cardinal Hinsley, endorsing the statement, said that it might be in a few instances the phraseology was not all that he could desire, 'but,' he added, 'as it stands I approve it, and I hope we shall see from this time on a great increase of co-operation and a vast amount of help from those who associate themselves either with one side or the other—the Sword of the Spirit or the Religion and Life movement'." The document, therefore, as such, does not enjoy the official character of a statement issued by the Hierarchy—for example, that on the justice of the war authorized by all the bishops and printed in the Catholic press, 16 September, 1939. On the other hand, it is "warmly commended", "endorsed", "approved" by the Ordinary of the diocese in which it was issued, and has the implied approval of all those Ordinaries who have welcomed the "Sword of the Spirit" into their dioceses. To proceed from the familiar to the unfamiliar, the document seems to us to have the character of a text issued not only with the Ordinary's *Imprimatur* but with his commendatory preface as well: neither an *Imprimatur* nor a commendatory preface necessarily implies that everything in the text is positively approved.

Co-operation means acting jointly for a common end or object: it is the object which specifies a movement, not the subjective status, condition or motives of the co-operators. For example, local residents, non-residents, socialists and conservatives may take common action for preserving the public right to a footpath, even though their motives for so doing may or may not be identical. Therefore, in defining or clarifying the limits of a joint movement, it is the object (*finis operis*) which must be examined, not the co-operators' beliefs or motives (*finis operantis*) which may or may not be shared in common.

The joint statement recently issued strongly supports the contention of many people that the object of co-operation between ourselves and non-Catholics is to be restricted, for the time being at any rate, to the truths of natural law. Notwithstanding the employment of such terms throughout the document as "Christian tradition", "Christian revelation", "Christian teaching and witness", "organized Christianity", a careful reading of the text makes it plain that the joint influence of all these Christian things and the joint activities of all the people accepting them are to be directed, as in point (1) to "social, economic and civic problems", or as in point (2) to "common action on broad lines of social and international policy". "Linked by this Committee," the document concludes, with admirable precision, "the two movements will work through parallel action in the religious, and joint action in the social and international field."

This meaning of the document is quite plain to us though it may not be equally plain to others. May we, therefore, quote the comments made by some members of the Committee on the subject? A prominently featured

article in the *Sunday Times*, 24 May, 1942, by Mr. Douglas Woodruff, heralding the forthcoming joint statement, makes it clear that the object of agreement is "to expound and defend the natural law, as it has been honoured by the Christian tradition". In the *Universe*, 29 May, 1942, Mr. Richard O'Sullivan, K.C., with the precision of a legal mind, establishes the same truth; and Fr. John Murray, S.J., in an explanatory article on Co-operation, similarly accepts this as the most obvious basis of agreement, though he also explores the possibility of one still wider.

The leader in the *Catholic Herald* of the same date, a thoughtful commentary on the document, observes that "the source of agreement is from the philosophic and social side of man's thought rather than from the specifically religious", and many will share the sense of relief which the writer of this leader records.

It would, however, be an error to suppose that the apparent limitation of the field of common action is a concession to the doctrinal tenets of Catholics alone. Many representative non-Catholics have realized its necessity ever since the time when His Eminence the Cardinal made the prospect of a common Christian front a practical issue. Writers, for example, in non-Catholic journals have deprecated joint action or contact with the "Sword of the Spirit" as diverting the attention of good Christians from the eternal menace of Rome, and most of us would much prefer to be the object of such honest suspicion rather than find ourselves lined up with other religious bodies in this country as one of the "Churches".

The most authoritative representative of the Anglican Church, because the best informed about the Catholic position, is another member of the Committee—the Bishop of Chichester. In his admirable "Penguin" book, *Christianity and World Order*, the doctrine of *Mortalium Animos* is correctly described, and there is given in outline a practical project for collaboration in social reconstruction on the basis of the Papal Peace Points. In the "Sword of the Spirit" bulletin, 27 November, 1941, may be seen the bishop's Cambridge University sermon, in which he records his conviction that everything connected with credal doctrines and Church order must definitely be excluded from the basis of co-operation.

After reading again the various papal utterances on the subject during the last ten years, from that of Pius XI in *Caritate Christi Compulsi*, 3 May, 1932, to the appeal of Pius XII in his radio address of Christmas Eve, 1941, we are more than ever convinced of the truth of Fr. Murray's statement in the *Month*, January, 1942, p. 65: "Here it is well to notice that the Pope does not base his general appeal on grounds that are specifically Christian. The Creator—the moral law—the natural order—all this would have been admitted by the philosophers of ancient Greece: it is acknowledged today by everybody who accepts the idea of a Creative God and the elementary consequences of that acceptance. Recent Popes, in their encyclical letters, have tended towards this wider appeal, which is perfectly valid for those outside the Catholic Church. Though there are naturally references in

this address to the specifically Christian character of Christmas and of Christ's peace, the main argument remains on the level of reason: it is intended as much for the 'good pagan', the 'man of good will', as for the convinced Christian."

Moreover, side by side with these papal appeals is affirmed the unity of the Church, a visible body with a visible head on earth. We are all aware of the lack of complete agreement amongst our own theologians in trying to define who is and who is not a member of the Church, since in one sense every baptized person is such, and in another sense, as implied in canon 87, a baptized adult in certain contingencies is not. A well-documented article by Fr. Victor White, O.P., in *Blackfriars*, September, 1941, reprinted in *Orate Fratres*, October, 1941, explores this problem and indicates the basis of a solution in the *Summa*, III, viii, 3. But whatever we hold about the condition of a baptized non-Catholic in good faith, and no matter how sympathetically we concede that he is in some sense a member of the Church, he is such as an individual person validly baptized, and never because of his adherence to an heretical or schismatical body.

It may be due to the crabbed and restricted outlook of a Seminary professor's mind, but we think it might be useful to find, if possible, some analogy with the present situation in the not too distant past. One example, though in a very limited sphere of co-operation, may be seen in the Papal settlement of the disputes about workmen's unions in Germany and France.¹ In both countries there were differences amongst Catholics on the lawfulness of associating with non-Catholics for some natural advantage in matters such as a just wage and proper working conditions. The papal decision recognized the necessity of this mixed association, and made certain rules for safeguarding the faithful from false social doctrines, the chief rule being that they must all be members as well of a Catholic labour organization. It seems that we have here an almost exact parallel, if one is desired, with the present question. Whatever it may have tended to become in the struggles of infancy, the "Sword of the Spirit" is now definitely recognized as a Catholic—nay, a "Roman" Catholic—association, and under its guidance members may securely collaborate with non-Catholic associations in the field of natural law and social reconstruction. There is, however, one big difference between the two situations. *Singulari Quadam* was rather a grudging toleration, whereas the papal encyclicals of the last few years contain an urgent appeal for collaboration, owing to the magnitude of the dangers threatening us all.

It may well happen, after a period of successful co-operation within the sphere of the natural law, that the way will be paved for some measure of agreement on objects specifically Christian, though there are imposing difficulties in the way. Again, in looking for some analogy in the not too distant past, we have an example, perhaps, in the instruction given by the

¹ Cf. *Singulari Quadam*, A.A.S., iv, 1912, p. 657, and *J. C. Concilii*, A.A.S., xxi, 1929, p. 657; also a study of the latter document in *Apollinaris*, 1931, p. 96.

Holy See to the American Apostolic Delegate in 1895.¹ The practice of Catholics meeting non-Catholics for discussions about religion and morality was discouraged, in marked contrast to the decision on workers' unions in *Longinqua Oceani*, 6 January 1895²; though more conservative in expression, this decision does not differ substantially from that given seventeen years later in *Singulari Quadam*. The letter to Cardinal Gibbons, *Testem Benevolentiae*, 22 January, 1899,³ recommends friendly conference with non-Catholics provided due safeguards exist, and to this extent rather negatives the directions of *Coetus in Federatis*. In America, at the present day, the Inter-Faith Movement has led to some discussion about these documents, and the *Ecclesiastical Review* for November, 1941, has an excellent article of a distinctly conservative kind by Fr. O'Connell, C.S.S.R., of the Catholic University, Washington. He perceives the dangers attached to these meetings, suggests safeguards, and calls attention to the law of canon 1325, §2.

Why be so suspicious of collaborating with non-Catholics for purposes other than those contained within the natural law? The reason is that it would tend towards fundamentalism in practice. Quite a good example of this may be seen in a pamphlet issued by the Christian Education Movement entitled "Can the Churches Agree?", which states, amongst other things, that "the development of theological research, and of co-operative conference between the great Christian bodies, has resulted in a new recognition of the measure of agreement as to the Faith". The assertion is true, as far as it goes, and is capable of a meaning which is theologically unassailable. But we have to remember that we are dealing with a popular movement, not with the discussions of theologians whose minds are trained to distinctions and sub-distinctions. The average lay person would conclude that, if there is a measure of agreement, it demonstrates that these beliefs must be either more true or more fundamental than the rest, and that all who accept them can therefore unite as one body on the basis of these beliefs alone.

There is objective equality in co-operating with non-Catholics for a recognition of the natural law, since this common ground is approachable by the light of unaided reason. To go beyond these limits into the realm of faith, as Dr. McReavy very clearly shows in his contribution to the *Tablet*, 23 May, 1942, can only be justified, if at all, by stressing the subjective duty of non-Catholics to follow a conscience which is invincibly erroneous. Even so, a Catholic must hold that the Church alone possesses the right to speak for Christ, and the question then arises whether non-Catholics can reasonably be expected to collaborate for religious purposes with those who make such an exclusive claim.

The restoration of the natural law, therefore, is the first, the most

¹ Cf. *Coetus in Federatis*, 18 Sept., 1895, *Acta Leonis XIII*, Desclée edition, 1900, vi, p. 97.

² *Fontes C.I.C.*, n. 628, §§ 16 and 17.

³ *Fontes C.I.C.*, n. 640, §13.

obvious, and the least controversial object on which co-operation with non-Catholics is likely to be successful. That it is a restoration of the old, not a novel experiment, should always be remembered. The Pope in *Summi Pontificatus* reminds us that the reason why these principles of natural law have been abandoned in Europe is to be traced to the widespread defection from the Church due to the principles of the Protestant Reformation, a truth which is often confirmed by non-Catholic writers. Mr. Kenneth Ingram, for example, in a contribution to *A Christian Basis for the Post-war World*¹ states: "Since the Reformation, Christianity has tended in many respects to promote nationalism, and the Roman Catholic Belloc school are correct in pointing to the sixteenth century as the period of dissolution which marks the beginning of the rival imperialisms which have led up to the present disaster."

The Church is, in fact, the guardian of the natural law and, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, teaches it infallibly to the faithful. But since both they and non-Catholics can appreciate its truths on grounds of natural reason alone, there is every reason to hope that both will greatly benefit by collaboration and the study it involves, and that their united labours and influence will be a stable foundation in post-war reconstruction. "We have seen," writes Bryce in *Studies in History and Jurisprudence*, "what good work it [the natural law] did for the ancient world in breaking down race prejudices and in particular for the Roman jurists in giving them a philosophical ideal towards which they could work in expanding and refining the law of the Empire. Nor should we forget that in later times it has sometimes stimulated resistance to oppression, and has corrected the tendency, always present among lawyers and in a ruling class, to defer unduly to tradition and to defend institutions which have become incompatible with reason, and hurtful to the common interest. . . . Who can say that an idea so ancient, in itself simple, yet capable of taking many aspects, an idea which has had so varied a history and so wide a range of influence, may not have a career reserved for it in the long future which still lies before the human race?"²

Our readers may find it convenient to have all together the text and translation of some papal directions, given during the last half century, touching on the question of what is and what is not permitted or recommended in our friendly relations with non-Catholics. For their full sense the context should be read. We have not included the many texts, culminating in *Mortalium Animos*, 6 January, 1928, which forbid or discourage reunion movements. It will be observed that the directions of the Holy See have become progressively liberal, gradually passing from mere tolerance to positive encouragement of association with non-Catholics. The movement courageously initiated by His Eminence the Cardinal is, we believe, the first attempt to put the desires of the Holy See into practice.

E. J. MAHONEY.

¹ Student Christian Movement, 1942, p. 44.

² Vol. II, p. 171.

(1) LEO XIII, *Longinqua Oceani*, 6 January, 1895

16. De ineundis quoque societatibus, diligentissime videndum ne quis errore fallatur. Atque hoc intelligi nominatim de opificibus volumus: quibus profecto coire in sodalitia, utilitatum sibi comparandarum gratia, ius est, libente Ecclesia, nec repugnante natura: sed vehementer interest, quibuscum sese coniungant, ne ubi rerum meliorum adiumenta requirunt, ibi in discrimen vocentur bonorum multo maximorum. . . .

17. Imo vero, quod est valde ad fidei incolumitatem conducibile, malle catholici debent cum catholicis congregari, nisi fieri eorum coegerit necessitas.

(*Fontes C.I.C.*, n. 628.)

It is very necessary to be watchful of error in joining societies, and we speak expressly of workers' unions. The Church holds, of course, that they have a natural right of associating for mutual advantage with their fellows, but it is important to consider the persons associated with, lest, in seeking to better their condition, goods of the highest order be imperilled. . . .

Unless there is some strong reason to the contrary, Catholics should preferably join Catholic associations, since this is a great means of preserving their faith unsullied.

(2) LEO XIII, *Coetus in Federatis*, 18 September, 1895

Coetus in foederatis Americae civitatibus celebrari subinde novimus, in quos viri promiscue conveniant tum e catholico nomine, tum ex iis qui a catholica Ecclesia dissident, simul de religione rectisque moribus acturi. In hoc equidem studium agnoscimus religiosae rei, quo gens ista ardentius in dies fertur. At quamvis communes hi coetus ad hunc diem prudenti silentio tolerati sunt, consultius tamen videatur si catholici homines suos seorsum conventus agant: quorum tamen utilitas ne in ipsos unice derivetur, ea lege indici poterunt, ut aditus ad audiendum universis pateat, iis etiam qui ab Ecclesia catholica seiunguntur. . . .

(*Acta Leonis XIII*,

Desclée ed., 1900, vi, p. 97.)

We have heard that in the United States of America meetings are frequently held, at which Catholics and non-Catholics assemble together for the purpose of exploring religious and moral questions. In this we recognize the zeal for religion which is growing in that nation. These meetings, indeed, have hitherto been tolerated with prudent silence, but it seems more advisable that Catholics should have their own meetings separately. However, in order that the usefulness of these gatherings may not be limited to Catholics, they can be held on the understanding that all may enter as listeners, including those who are separated from the Catholic Church. . . .

(3) LEO XIII, *Testem Benevolentiae*, 22 January, 1899

13. Ex Dei verbo habemus, omnium officium esse proximorum saluti iuvandae operam dare. Fideles quidem hoc sibi a Deo assignatum munus exequentur morum integritate, christianae caritatis operibus, instante ad Deum ipsum assidueque prece. At qui e clero sunt idipsum praestent oportet sapienti Evangelii praedicatione. . . . Quod si, e diversis rationibus verbi Dei eloquendi, ea quandoque praeferenda videatur, qua ad dissidentes non in templis dicant sed privato quovis honesto loco, nec ut qui disputent sed ut qui amice colloquantur; res quidem reprehensione caret: modo tamen ad id muneris auctoritate Episcoporum ii destinentur, qui scientiam integritatemque suam antea ipsis pro-

We are taught by holy writ that it is the duty of everyone, each in his own degree and measure, to labour for his neighbour's salvation, and the faithful most effectively observe this divine charge by living good lives, performing charitable works and praying unceasingly to God. The clergy fulfil this obligation by preaching the gospel wisely. . . . But there are various ways of spreading the word of God, and it may sometimes appear preferable to address non-Catholics in some secluded and suitable place instead of in a church, not disputing with them but conversing in a friendly manner. There can be no objection to this practice provided that the speakers selected by episcopal authority are people

baverint. Nam plurimos apud vos arbitramur esse, qui ignoratione magis quam voluntate a catholicis dissident; quos ad unum Christi ovile facilius forte adducet, qui veritatem illis proponat amico quodam familiarique sermone.

(*Fontes C.I.C.*, n. 640.)

(4) PIUS X, *Singulari Quadam*, 24 September, 1912

Nisi enim mature excitentur ad vigilandum, patet periculum eis esse ne paulatim et quasi imprudenter in vago quodam nec definito genere Christianae religionis acquiescant, quae *interconfessionalis* dici solet, et cum inani communitatis Christianae religionis commendatione diffunditur, cum tamen manifesto nihil ea sit praedicationi Jesu Christi magis contrarium. . . .

Ex quo illud consequitur ut consociationes huiusmodi, confessionis, ut aiunt, catholicae, in regionibus catholicorum certe, ac praeterea in aliis omnibus, ubicumque per eas variis sociorum necessitatibus consuli posse videatur, institui atque omni ope adjuvari oporteat. Neque vero—si de iis consociationibus agitur quae causam religionis et morum directe aut oblique contingant—res foret quae probari ullo modo posset, in iis ipsis regionibus quas modo memoravimus, fovere et propagare velle consociationes mistas, id est, quae ex catholicis et acatholicis confentur. Etenim, ut alia omittamus, in magnis sane periculis ob societates huius generis versantur aut certe versari possunt nostrorum et integritas fidei et iusta obtemperatio legibus praeceptisque Ecclesiae catholicae. . . .

Nos igitur mere catholicas, quotquot sunt in Germania consociationes opificum perlibenter omni ornatus laude, cupimusque bene evenire quicquid nituntur in commodum multitudinis operariae, laetioraque semper eis optamus incrementa. Veruntamen, hoc cum dicimus, non negamus fas esse catholicis, ut meliorem opifici fortunam, aequiorem mercedis et laboris conditionem quaerant aut alia quavis honestae utilitatis causa, communiter cum acatholicis cautione adhibita, laborare pro communi bono. Sed eius rei gratia, malum catholicas societates et acatholicas jungi inter se foedere per illud opportunum inventum quod *Cartel* dicitur. . . .

of approved knowledge and integrity. For we believe that there are many men of good will amongst you who are non-Catholics simply through lack of knowledge; they will be more easily drawn to the one fold of Christ if the truth is put to them in the course of a friendly conference.

Unless they are warned in time and put on their guard, there is clearly a danger of exposing them gradually and almost unconsciously to a vague and indefinite kind of *interconfessional* Christianity, which is being widely spread and wrongly commended amongst Christians. Nothing could be more opposed to the teaching of Jesus Christ. . . .

Hence, both in Catholic countries and in other regions where it appears possible by this means to further the interests of members, Catholic unions should be started and encouraged in every way. In all such places no approval can be given to associations composed of Catholics and non-Catholics, if the purpose of these associations touches directly or indirectly on religion or morals. The reason is that, in mixed associations of this kind, the faith of our Catholic people and their loyalty to the laws and guidance of the Catholic Church are endangered either actually or potentially. . . .

We therefore heartily praise and approve the various Catholic unions of this kind existing in Germany; we wish them success in all their schemes for the benefit of working people, and we desire to see them happily increase and flourish. We affirm, nevertheless, that Catholics have the right, with all due safeguards, to unite with non-Catholics for the common good, in bettering the state of labour, in obtaining juster wages and fairer working conditions, and for any good and useful project. We regard the *Cartel* pact as most opportune for this purpose, and we would prefer collaboration between Catholics and non-Catholics to be effected by this means. . . .

Cui Nos petitioni, respicientes peculiarem rei Catholicae rationem in Germania, putamus concedendum, declaramusque tolerari posse, et permitti Catholicis, ut eas quoque societates mistas, quae in vestris sunt diocesis, participant, quoad ex novis rerum adiunctis non desinat huiusmodi tolerantia aut opportuna esse aut iusta; ita tamen, si cautiones adhibeantur idoneae ad declinanda pericula quae in eius generis consociationibus inesse diximus. Quarum cautionum haec praecipua sunt capita. Primum omnium, curandum est ut qui opifices catholici horum Syndicatum participes sunt, iidem catholicis operationum societatibus, quae *Arbeitervereine* appellatione notantur, sint adscripti. . . .

Praeterea Syndicatus iidem—ut sint tales quibus catholici dare nomen possint—necesse est ab omni se continent vel ratione vel re quae cum doctrinis mandatisque Ecclesiae legitimaevae potestatis sacrae non conveniat; itemque ne quid minus probandum ex hoc capite aut scripta, aut dicta, aut facta eorum praebant.

(A.A.S., iv, 1912, p. 657.)

Having regard, therefore, to the special situation of Catholicism in Germany, we accede to your petition. We declare that Catholics may be permitted to join the mixed unions existing in your dioceses, and that this practice may be tolerated until new circumstances make it inopportune or unlawful. We make this declaration on condition that suitable precautions are taken to minimize the dangers inherent, as we have said, in associations of this kind. The chief safeguards are, firstly, to ensure that the members of mixed unions shall also belong to the *Catholic Workers' Union*. . . .

In addition, if Catholics are to be members of these mixed unions, it is essential that the unions themselves shall avoid any theory or action opposed to the teaching and precepts of the Church or of the competent ecclesiastical authority, and that they shall refrain from anything reprehensible in their writings, speeches and deeds.

(5) CODEX IURIS CANONICI (1918)

Canon 1258, §1. Haud licitum est fidelibus quovis modo active assistere seu partem habere in sacris acatholicorum.

§2. Tolerari potest praesentia passiva seu mere materialis, civilis officii vel honoris causa, ob gravem rationem ab Episcopo in casu dubii probandam, in acatholicorum funeribus, nuptiis, similibusque sollemniis, dummodo perverisionis et scandali periculum absit.

Canon 1325, §3. Caveant catholici ne disputationes vel collationes, publicas praesertim, cum acatholicis habeant, sine venia Sanctae Sedis aut, si casus urgeat, loci Ordinarii.

Canon 1350, §1. Ordinarii locorum et parochi acatholicos, in suis diocesisibus et paroeciis degentes, commendatos sibi in Domino habeant,

It is unlawful for the faithful in any way whatever to assist actively or to take part in the religious acts of non-Catholics.

At the funerals, marriages and similar solemnities of non-Catholics, provided there is no danger of scandal or perversion, passive or purely material presence of Catholics may be tolerated for a grave reason, which must have episcopal approval in doubtful cases.

Catholics must beware of having disputationes and conferences with non-Catholics, especially in public, unless permission is obtained from the Holy See or, in urgent cases, from the local Ordinary.

Local Ordinaries and parish priests must regard non-Catholics living in their dioceses and parishes as commended to them in the Lord.

(6) S. C. CONCILII, *Lettre à Mgr. Lienart*, 5 June, 1929

Quant aux associations ouvrières, bien que leur but soit de procurer des avantages temporels à leurs membres, celles-là cependant méritent une approbation sans réserve et doivent être regardées comme les plus propres de toutes à assurer les intérêts vrais et durables de leurs membres, qui ont été fondées en prenant pour principale base la religion catholique, et qui suivent ouvertement les directions de l'Eglise: Nous l'avons fréquemment déclaré Nous-même, lorsque l'occasion s'en est offerte dans un pays ou dans l'autre. Il s'ensuit qu'il est nécessaire d'établir et de favoriser de toute manière ce genre d'associations confessionnelles catholiques, comme on les appelle, dans les contrées catholiques tout d'abord, et aussi dans toutes les autres régions, partout où il paraîtra possible de subvenir par leur moyen aux besoins divers des associés.. (Cf. Pie X, *Singulari quadam*.) . . .

Pour ce qui regarde la constitution, à titre exceptionnel, de ce que l'on appelle un *cartel intersyndical*, entre syndicats chrétiens et syndicats neutres ou même socialistes, pour la défense d'intérêts légitimes: qu'on se rappelle toujours qu'un tel cartel n'est licite qu'à la condition qu'il se fasse seulement dans certains cas particuliers, que la cause qu'on veut défendre soit juste, qu'il s'agisse d'accord temporaire et que l'on prenne toutes les précautions pour éviter les périls qui peuvent provenir d'un tel rapprochement.

(A.A.S., xxi, 1929, p. 494.)

(7) PIUS XI, *Caritate Christi Compulsi*, 3 May, 1932

. . . neque in unam catholicam religionem, verum in eas omnes, quae Deum adspectabilis huius mundi auctorem agnoscunt rerum omnium moderatorem supremum (invehuntur).

Itaque omnes, tam privatos homines, quam civitates in Domino obtestamur . . . coniungantur omnes, gravia quoque, si opus fuerit damna subeuntes, ut se atque hominum societatem sospitent universam. Qua in animorum viriumque coniunctione primas profecto sibi vindicare debent, qui christiano gloriantur nomine, illustria aevi apostolici exempla recolentes, cum "multitudinis credentium

As regards workers' unions, it is true that their purpose is to assure the temporal welfare of members. Nevertheless the unions which deserve unqualified approbation, and which must be regarded as assuring in the best possible way the true and lasting welfare of members, are those unions which have been erected with the Catholic religion as their chief basis, and which openly follow the directions of the Church. This is what we have frequently declared whenever the question arose in various countries. Hence in Catholic countries most of all, and in other regions wherever it appears possible by this means to further the interests of members, Catholic unions should be started and in every way encouraged. Cf. *Singulari Quadam*, 24 September, 1912. . . .

For exceptional reasons an inter-associational *Cartel* may be established, for the lawful interests of members, between Christian unions and those which are non-religious or even socialist. It must then always be remembered that a *Cartel* of this kind is only lawful on the following conditions: that the practice is restricted to certain individual cases; that it is done in defence of a just cause; that the alliance is of a temporary character; and that every precaution is taken to avoid the dangers which are liable to arise from such collaboration.

Nor are these assaults directed only against the Catholic religion, but against all religions which still recognize God as Creator of heaven and earth, and as absolute Lord of all things. . . .

In the name of the Lord, therefore, we conjure individuals and nations. . . . Let them all unite together, even at the cost of heavy sacrifices, to save themselves and mankind. In such a union of minds and forces, they naturally ought to be the first, who are proud of the Christian name, mindful of the glorious tradition of apostolic times, when "the multitude of believers had but one heart

erat cor unum et anima una" (Act. iv, 32); sed etiam omnes quotquot Deum agnoscunt sincereque atque ex animo reverentur, in idem suam conferant opem, ut ingens, quod cunctis imminet, periculum ab humano genere propulsetur.

(A.A.S., xxiv, 1932, p. 177.)

(8) PIUS XI, *Mit Brennender Sorge*, 14 March, 1937

Der Christusklaube wird sich nicht rein und unverfälscht erhalten, wenn er nicht gestützt und umbeugt wird vom Glauben an die Kirche, "die Säule und Grundfeste der Wahrheit" (1 Tim. iii, 15). Christus selbst, Gott hochgelobt in Ewigkeit, hat diese Säule des Glaubens aufgerichtet. . . . Wer an diese Einheit und Untrennbarkeit rührt, nimmt der Braut Christi eines der Diademe, mit denen Gott selbst sie gekrönt hat. Er unterwirft ihnen auf ewigen Fundamenten ruhenden Gottesbau der Ueberprüfung und Umgestaltung durch Baumeister, denen der Vater im Himmel keine Bauvollmacht erteilt hat. . . .

Der Kirchenglaube wird nicht rein und unverfälscht erhalten, wenn er nicht gestützt wird vom Glauben an den Primat des Bischofs von Rom. . . . Wenn Leute, die nicht einmal im Glauben an Christus einig sind, auch das Wunsch- und Lockbild einer deutschen Nationalkirche vorhalten, so wisset: sie ist nichts als eine Verneinung der einen Kirche Christi, ein offenkundiger Abfall von dem an die ganze Welt gerichteten Missionsbefehl, dem nur eine Weltkirche genügen und nachleben kann. Der geschichtliche Weg anderer Nationalkirchen, ihre geistige Erstarrung, ihre Umklammerung oder Knechtung durch irdische Gewalten zeigen die hoffnungslose Unfruchtbarkeit, der jeder vom lebendigen Weinstock der Kirche sich abtrennende Rebzweig mit unentrinnbarer Sicherheit anheimfällt. . . .

Ein besonders wachsames Auge, Ehrwürdige Brüder, werdet Ihr haben müssen, wenn religiöse Grundbegriffe ihres Wesensinhaltes beraubt und in einem profanen Sinne umgedeutet werden.

Offenbarung im christlichen Sinn ist das Wort Gottes an die Menschen. Dieses gleiche Wort zu gebrauchen für die "Einflüsterungen" von Blut und Rasse, für die Ausstrahlungen der Geschichte eines Volkes ist in jedem Fall verwirrend.

and soul"; but let all those who still believe in God and adore Him loyally heartily concur, in order to ward off from mankind the great danger that threatens all alike.

(C.T.S. S., 111.)

Belief in Christ will not be preserved true and genuine, if not supported and protected by belief in the Church, "the pillar and ground of the truth". Christ Himself, God praised for ever in the ages, has erected this pillar of faith. . . . He who touches this unity and indivisibility takes from the Bride of Christ one of the diadems with which God himself has crowned her. He subjects her divine structure that rests on eternal foundations to the re-examinations and remodelling of architects, to whom the heavenly Father has granted no plenipotentary powers to build. . . .

Belief in the Church will not be kept pure and genuine, if it is not supported by belief in the primacy of the Bishop of Rome. . . . When people, who are not even united by faith in Christ, hold before you as a thing to be desired or allure you with the picture of a German national church, know this: it is nothing but the denial of the Church of Christ, a manifest apostasy from the command to evangelize the whole world, to whose fulfilment only a universal church can be commensurate. The history of other national churches, their spiritual torpor, their attachment to or enslavement by earthly powers, show the hopeless sterility that comes over every branch that separates itself from the living vine of the Church. . . .

You must be especially alert, Venerable Brethren, when fundamental religious concepts are robbed of their intrinsic content and made to mean something else in a profane sense.

Revelation, in the Christian sense, is the word of God to man. To use the same word for the "whispered inspirations" of blood and race, for the manifestations of the history of a people, is confusing in any case. Such false coinage

Solch falsche Münze verdient nicht, in den Sprachschatz eines gläubigen Christen überzugehen.

Glaube ist das sichere Fürwahrhalten dessen, was Gott geoffenbart hat und durch die Kirche zu glauben vorstellt: "die feste Ueberzeugung vom Unsichtbaren" (Heb. xi, 1). . . .

Im innerstaatlichen Leben verkennt er, Nützlichkeits- und Rechtserwägungen miteinander verquickend, die grundlegende Tatsache, dass der Mensch als Persönlichkeit gottgegebene Rechte besitzt, die jedem auf ihre Leugnung, Aufhebung oder Brachlegung abzielen den Eingriff vonseiten der Gemeinschaft entzogen bleiben müssen. Die Missachtung dieser Wahrheit übersieht, dass das wahre Gemeinwohl letztlich bestimmt und erkannt wird aus der Natur des Menschen mit ihrem harmonischen Ausgleich zwischen persönlichem Recht und sozialer Bindung, sowie aus dem durch die gleiche Menschennatur bestimmten Zweck der Gemeinschaft. Die Gemeinschaft ist vom Schöpfer gewollt als Mittel zur vollen Entfaltung der individuellen und sozialen Anlagen, die der Einzelmensch, gebend und nehmend, zu seinem und aller anderen Wohl auszuwerten hat. Auch jene umfassenderen und höheren Werte, die nicht vom Einzelnen, sondern nur von der Gemeinschaft verwirklicht werden können, sind vom Schöpfer letzten Endes des Menschen halber gewollt, zu seiner natürlichen und übernatürlichen Entfaltung und Vollendung. Ein Abweichen von dieser Ordnung rüttelt an den Tragfeilern, auf denen die Gemeinschaft ruht, und gefährdet damit Ruhe, Sicherheit, ja Bestand der Gemeinschaft selbst.

Der gläubige Mensch hat ein unverlierbares Recht, seinen Glauben zu bekennen und in den ihm gemässen Formen zu betätigen. Gesetze, die das Bekenntnis und die Betätigung dieses Glaubens unterdrücken oder erschweren, stehen im Widerspruch mit einem Naturgesetz.

Gewissenhafte, ihrer erzieherischen Pflicht bewusste Eltern haben ein erstes und ursprüngliches Recht, die Erziehung der ihnen von Gott geschenkten Kinder im Geiste des wahren Glaubens und in Uebereinstimmung mit seinen Grundsätzen und Vorschriften zu bestimmen. Gesetze oder andere Massnahmen, die diesen naturrechtlich gegebenen Elternwillen in Schulfragen ausschalten oder

does not deserve to be received into the vocabulary of a believing Christian.

Faith is the certain holding as true what God has revealed and through His Church proposes for belief, "the evidence of things that appear not". . . .

In political life within the State, since it confuses considerations of utility with those of right, it mistakes the basic fact that man as a person possesses God-given rights, which must be preserved from all attacks aimed at denying, suppressing, or disregarding them. To pay no heed to this truth is to overlook the fact, that the true public good is finally determined and recognized by the nature of man, with its harmonious co-ordination of personal rights and social obligations, as well as by the purpose of the community, which in turn is conditioned by the same human nature. The community is willed by the Creator as the means to the full development of the individual and social attainments, which the individual, by a give and take process, has to employ to his own good and that of others. Also those higher and more comprehensive values, that cannot be realized by the individual but only by the community, in the final analysis are intended by the Creator for the sake of the individual, for his natural and supernatural development and perfection. A deviation from this order loosens the supports on which the community is placed, and thereby imperils the tranquillity, security, and even the existence of the community itself.

The believer has an inalienable right to profess his faith and put it into practice in the manner suited to him. Laws that suppress or make this profession and practice difficult contradict the natural law.

Conscientious parents, aware of their duty in the matter of education, have a primary and original right to determine the education of the children, given to them by God, in the spirit of the true faith and in agreement with its principles and ordinances. Laws or other regulations concerning schools that disregard the rights of parents guaranteed to them by the natural law, or by threat and

durch Drohung und Zwang unwirksam machen, stehen im Widerspruch zum Naturrecht und sind im tiefsten un letzten Kern unsittlich.

(A.A.S., xxix, 1937, p. 145.)

(9) PIUS XI, *Divini Redemptoris*, 19 March, 1937

Sed ad vim propulsandam, qua "potestas tenebrarum" Dei ipsius opinionem ex intimis hominum mentibus evellere contendit, summa in spe sumus cum eis qui Christiano nomine gloriantur, se etiam illos efficienter coniuncturos esse, qui, longe maxima nempe hominum pars, Deum esse credunt et adorant.

(A.A.S., xxix, 1937, p. 65.)

(10) PIUS XII, *Summi Pontificatus*, 20 October, 1939

Quae aetate hac nostra experti sumus rerum discrimina anxitudinesque catholicorum hominum animos ad mutuam necessitudinem excitant, eiusdemque fraternae necessitudinis sensum purificant magisque exacuunt, quam fortasse numquam alias; atque in iis omnibus, qui Deum esse credunt ac Iesum Christum sequuntur ducem ac magistrum, conscientiam reviviscere iubent commune periculum in universos una simul impendere minaciter.

Mutuae huius catholicorum necessitudinis sensus, quem, ut diximus, periclitatae res tantopere auxere, quique mentes recolligendo confirmat futuraeque victoriae voluntatem alit, suavissima Nos delectatione summoque solacio iis diebus affecit, cum trepido gressu, at Deo fidentes ad eam rite obtinendam Cathedram processimus, quam magnus Decessor Noster vacantem reliquerat. . . .

Quodsi iam tum magnam accepti ponderis gravitatem experiebamur, quam summa potestas Nobis imposuerat providentissimi Dei nutu data, et maximo afficiebamur solacio, dum luculentissime testatam individuum cernebamus unitatem Catholicae Ecclesiae, quae, quasi in vallum ac propugnaculum conformata, tum invictae Beati Petri arci firmitus arctiusque coniungitur, cum acrior increscit inimicorum Christi iactantia.

Universa haec catholicae unitatis ac fraternae divinitusque inditae popu-

violence nullify those rights, contradict the natural law and are utterly and essentially immoral.

(C.T.S., H. 272.)

But in this battle joined by the powers of darkness against the very idea of Divinity, it is Our fond hope that, besides the host which glories in the name of Christ, all those—and they comprise the overwhelming majority of mankind—who still believe in God and pay Him homage may take a decisive part.

(C.T.S., S. 139.)

The dangers and anxieties we have encountered in these times of ours are such as to arouse the minds of Catholics to a sense of their common kinship, to refine and to sharpen the sense of that kinship as, perhaps, no other need has. Nay, among all those who believe that there is a God and follow Jesus Christ as their Leader and Master, they may well give strength to the reflection that a common peril, one and the same everywhere, hangs over us all.

This sense of common kinship among Catholics has been greatly increased, as We have said, by the dangers which surround us. It fortifies our minds by drawing them together, and nourishes our resolution to achieve victory. It has been a welcome refreshment and a supreme consolation to Us in these days during which, with faltering steps but with undiminished confidence in God, We have taken due possession of the See which Our great Predecessor had left widowed. . . .

We had begun to feel already the difficulty of sustaining the weight laid upon Us by the supreme power God's will had entrusted to Us. And it was a great consolation to Us to see such abundant proof of the indivisible unity which reigns in the Catholic Church: a unity which may be compared to a wall or rampart, that attaches itself more surely and more closely to Blessed Peter's impregnable citadel, in proportion as the boastful power of Christ's enemies makes greater head.

This general acknowledgment of Catholic unity and of that God-given

lorum necessitudinis testificatio erga communem omnium Patrem, eo Nobis uberiolem videbatur felicioremque spem afferre, quo formidolosiora in res in animosque impendebant tempora. Ac iucunda eiusmodi recordatio per primos Pontificatus Nostri menses suavissime Nos affecit, dum labores, sollicitudinesque perpeti ac discrimina superare necesse fuit, quibus mysticae Iesu Christi Sponsae iter contextitur.

Ac praeterire silentio nolumus quam accepta Nobis fuerint eorum quoque omnia ac vota, qui, etsi ad aspectabilem non pertinent Catholicae Ecclesiae compagem, pro sua tamen ipsorum ingenta nobilitate sinceritateque animi, id omne oblivione obrui noluerit, quo vel ob amorem erga Christi personam, vel ob Dei fidem Nobiscum copulantur. Hi igitur omnes pergratae habeant voluntatis Nostrae significationem. Eos Nos singulos universos divinae committimus tutelae divinoque regimini; dum solemniter asseveramus hoc uno Nos consilio moveri ac dirigi, Boni scilicet Pastoris exempla sedulo imitandi, ut omnes ad veri nominis felicitatem adducamus, utque omnes "vitam habeant et abundantius habeant." . . .

Ac principio, compertum omnino est primum altiolemque malorum fontem, quibus hodierna afflicta civitas, ex eo scaturere, quod universalis de morum probitate pernegetur ac reiiciatur norma, cum in privata singulorum vita, tum in ipsa re publica atque in mutuis necessitudinum rationibus, quae inter gentes nationesque intercedunt; ipsa videlicet naturalis detractione oblivioneque obruitur. . . .

Ut profecto nostis, Venerabiles Fratres, ea de causa omnis in ordine morum probitatis fundamentum in Europa olim reici coeptum est, quod homines non pauci a Iesu Christi doctrina abducti sunt, cuius Beati Petri cathedra custos est atque magistra. Qua quidem doctrina ita per revoluta saecula Europae populi coaluere christianoque spiritu conformati sunt, ut Cruce nobilitati, et humaniores cultioresque effecti, ad tam provectam publicae civilisque rei progressionem pervenirent, ut ceteras quoque gentes ac terras omne genus disciplinis excolerent. At cum ab incranti Ecclesiae magisterio se vindicavissent plures a Nobis seiuncti fratres eo,

bond which unites the nations in kinship, made in the presence of their common Father, seemed to bring with it hopes that were all the richer and happier, for the ominous times that were then overshadowing the fortunes and the minds of men. These gracious memories sweetened for Us those first months of Our Pontificate, even while We had to undergo the labours, the anxieties, and the perils which grow like thorns about the path of Jesus Christ's mystical Bride.

Nor must We forget to say how welcome were the good wishes and prayers of others who do not belong to the visible framework of the Catholic Church. In their generosity and honesty they could not bring themselves to forget all those links which bind them to Us, our common love of Christ's person, our common belief in God. Let them accept this expression of Our grateful goodwill. We commit them, one and all, to God's care and God's guidance; and We give them the solemn assurance that the one aim which inspires and directs Us is that of constantly following the Good Shepherd's example, so that We may lead all into that happiness which alone deserves the name, so that all "may have life and may have it more abundantly. . . ."

One leading mistake We may single out, as the fountain-head, deeply hidden, from which the evils of the modern state derive their origin. Both in private life and in the state itself, and moreover in the mutual relations of race with race, of country with country, the one universal standard of morality is set aside; by which We mean the natural law, now buried away under a mass of destructive criticism and of neglect. . . .

As you know, Worshipful Brethren, the reason why the principles of morality in general have long since been set aside in Europe is the defection of so many minds from Christian doctrine, of which Blessed Peter's See is the appointed guardian and teacher. As the centuries rolled over Europe, its nations were welded together by that doctrine, and it was the Christian spirit which formed them. Ennobled by the Cross, humanized and civilized by its influence, they reached such a high level of statesmanship and of citizenship that they could pass on the lesson they had learned, in its various forms, to the other nations and countries of the world. Then a time came when many of the

proh dolor, processerunt, ut ipsam Servatoris nostri divinitatem, quod christianae doctrinae caput est ac veluti centrum, respuendo subverterent, religionis conversionem dissolutionemque maturantes.

(A.A.S., xxxi, 1939, p. 413.)

Christian family separated themselves from the infallible teaching of the Church; and it was after that that they went, alas, even further, and rejected the very doctrine of our Saviour's divinity, which is the fountain and the focus of all Christian teaching. In doing this, they were hastening on a general deterioration and decline of the religious idea.

(C.T.S., S. 151, tr. by Mgr. R. A. Knox.)

(11) PIUS XII, *Sertum Laetitiae*, 1 November, 1939

Memoratum nuperrime pontificalis magisterii Documentum necnon similis generis Encyclicas Litteras Leonis Pp. XIII *Rerum Novarum*, ubi ad Evangelii et perennis philosophiae praecepta quaestio socialis absolvitur, gratum est Nobis nosse istic diu multumque considerari a lectissimis quibusdam, quos generosa voluntas ad caritatem atque societatem humanam restaurandam compellit, herosque ipsos nonnullos, huiusmodi ad placita cum mercennariis semper rediviva discidia velle componere, communi utilitate et humanarum personarum dignitate animadversis. Quae erit laus, si americanum genus, quod ad magnificentiam et munificentiam natura est proclive, feliciori aevo iecerit fundamentum, salebrosa et annosa sociali quaestione tutâ per vias Evangelii iubare illustratas plene et bene persoluta. Quod ut auspicio fiat, non frangendae sunt dissipatione vires, sed functione quam maxime augendae. Ad quam salubrem consiliorum unitatem consensionemque, magnorum altricem facinorum, caritate compulsi eos quoque invitamus, quos Mater Ecclesia a se divulsos deflet. Plerique ex iis, cum Decessor Noster sanctorum somno quievisset et Nos, brevi exacto ab eius excessu tempore, inscrutabili divinae pietatis consilio Petri Solum conscendissemus—id Nos non fugit—ore scriptisque sensus prodiderunt obsequii et insignis nobilitatis plenos; quapropter—id aperte fatemur—de iis spem cepimus, quam tempus non rapit, quam praesaga mens alit, quae Nobis inter aspera et dura solacio est.

(A.A.S. xxxi, 1939, p. 643.)

The social question is fully treated, by reference to the Gospel precepts and those of natural philosophy, both in the document We have mentioned above and in Pope Leo XIII's Encyclical *Rerum Novarum*. We are glad to learn that in your country both of these are made the subject of study by choice minds, inspired by a noble purpose of restoring goodwill in our social relations; further, that some of the employers themselves express willingness to settle constantly-recurring disputes with their workmen on these lines, with due regard to the public welfare, and the dignity of man. It will be a triumph indeed if the American people, with its genius for splendid and unselfish action, should thus lay the foundations of a better world, solving once for all this old and thorny question, and still keeping to the safe paths which the light of the Gospel reveals to us. If this fortunate result is to be achieved, our forces must not be weakened by disunion; we must join them, and so add to their effectiveness. It is only by united and concerted action that we can foster great schemes. For that reason, We are impelled by charity to invite here the co-operation of those, whom Mother Church mourns as separated from her communion. Many of these expressed, personally or by writing, sentiments that were full of respect and of generosity, at the time when Our Predecessor had gone to his hallowed rest and We, after a short interval, had been raised by the inscrutable design of Providence to the Throne of Peter. We were fully sensible of that, and We freely confess that it has given Us hopes in their regard which have not since then diminished; Our mind cherishes those hopes as it looks forward into the future, and derives consolation from them amidst all the difficult tasks that confront Us.

(C.T.S., S. 152, tr. by Mgr. R. A. Knox.)

(12) PIUS XII, *Sermon*, 24 December, 1939

5° Ma anche i regolamenti migliori e più compiuti saranno imperfetti e condannati in definitiva all'insuccesso, se quei che dirigono le sorti dei popoli, e i popoli stessi, non si lasciano penetrare sempre più da quello spirito, da cui solo può provenire vita, autorità e obbligazione alla lettera morta dei paragrafi negli ordinamenti internazionali; da quel senso, cioè, di intima e acuta responsabilità che misura e pondera gli statuti umani secondo le sane e incrollabili norme del diritto divino; da quella fame e sete di giustizia, che è proclamata come beatitudine nel Sermone della Montagna e che ha come naturale presupposto la giustizia morale; da quell'amore universale, che è il compendio e il termine più proteso dell'ideale cristiano e per ciò getta un ponte anche verso coloro, i quali non hanno il bene di partecipare alla stessa nostra fede. . . .

Ma se mai vi fu scopo degno del concorso degli spiriti nobili e generosi, se mai sorse ardimento di crociata spirituale, in cui con nuova verità risuonasse il grido "Dio lo vuole", è veramente quest'altissimo scopo e questa crociata e lotta di cuori puri e magnanimi, ingaggiata per ricondurre i popoli dalle torbide cisterne di interessi materiali ed egoistici all'fonte viva del diritto divino. . . .

(A.A.S. xxxii, 1940, p. 11.)

(13) PIUS XII, *Nuntius Radiophonicus*, 24 December, 1941

Senza dubbio anche qui non vogliamo tacere la lode dovuta alla saggezza di quei Governanti, che o sempre favorirono o vollero e seppero rimettere in onore, con vantaggio del popolo, i valori della civiltà cristiana nei felici rapporti fra Chiesa e Stato, nella tutela della santità del matrimonio, nella educazione religiosa della gioventù. Ma non possiamo chiudere gli occhi alla triste visione del progressivo scristianamento individuale e sociale, . . .

La futura ricostruzione esigerà intelletti di larghe vedute e volontà di fermi propositi, uomini coraggiosi e operosi, ma, sopra tutto e avanti tutto, coscienze, le quali nei disegni, nelle deliberazioni e

V. But even the best and most detailed regulations will be imperfect and foredoomed to failure unless the peoples and those who govern them submit willingly to the influence of that spirit which alone can give life, authority, and binding force to the dead letter of international agreements. They must develop that sense of deep and keen responsibility which measures and weighs human statutes according to the sacred and inviolable standards of the law of God; they must cultivate that hunger and thirst after justice which is proclaimed as a beatitude in the Sermon on the Mount and which supposes as its natural foundation the moral virtue of justice; they must be guided by that universal love which is the compendium and most general expression of the Christian ideal, and which therefore may serve as a common ground also for those who have not the blessing of sharing the same faith with us. . . .

If ever there was an objective deserving the collaboration of all noble and generous minds, if ever there was a spiritual crusade which might assume with new truth as its motto "God wills it", then it is this high purpose, it is this *crusade*, enlisting all unselfish and great-hearted men in an endeavour to lead the nations back from the broken cisterns of material and selfish interests to the living fountain of divine justice. . . .

(C.T.S., S. 153, tr. by Canon G. D. Smith.)

We would not have it thought at this point that We refuse a proper tribute of praise to the wisdom of those governments which have either always promoted the values of Christian civilization, or have done their best to re-establish them, by preserving good relations between Church and State, by safeguarding the sanctity of marriage, by fostering the religious education of youth. But it is impossible to shut one's eyes to the unhappy spectacle of a gradual apostasy from Christianity in individuals and in society, . . .

The work of reconstruction will require breadth of view and firm resolve; it will need men of courage and energy; but above all it will need men who are conscientious, men who in their plans,

nelle azioni siano animate e mosse e sostenute da un vivo senso di responsabilità, e non rifuggano dall'inchinarsi davanti alle sante leggi di Dio; . . .

Ora le rovine di questa guerra sono troppo ingenti, da non dovervisi aggiungere anche quelle di una pace frustrata e delusa; e perciò ad evitare tanta sciagura, conviene che con sincerità di volere e di energia, con proposito di generoso contributo, vi cooperino, non solo questo o quel partito, non solo questo o quel popolo, ma tutti i popoli, anzi l'intera umanità. È un'intrapresa universale di bene comune, che richiede la collaborazione della Cristianità, per gli aspetti religiosi e morali del nuovo edificio che si vuol costruire. . . .

Tale nuovo ordinamento, che tutti i popoli anelano di veder attuato, dopo le prove e le rovine di questa guerra, ha da essere innalzato sulla rupe incrollabile e immutabile della legge morale, manifestata dal Creatore stesso per mezzo dell'ordine naturale e da Lui scolpita nei cuori degli uomini con caratteri incancellabili; legge morale la cui osservanza deve venir inculcata e promossa dall'opinione pubblica di tutte le Nazioni e di tutti gli Stati con tale unanimità di voce e di forza, che nessuno possa osare di porla in dubbio o attenuarne il vincolo obbligante. . . .

Nel campo di un nuovo ordinamento fondato sui principi morali, non vi è posto per la persecuzione della religione e della Chiesa. Da una fede viva in un Dio personale trascendente si sprigiona una schietta e resistente vigoria morale che informa tutto il corso della vita; perchè la fede non è solo una virtù, ma la porta divina per la quale entrano nel tempio dell'anima tutte le virtù, e si costituisce quel carattere forte e tenace che non vacilla nei cimenti della ragione e del a giustizia.

Quanto alla questione sociale in particolare, che al finir della guerra si presenterà più acuta, i Nostri Predecessori e anche Noi stessi abbiamo segnato norme di soluzione; le quali però convien considerare che potranno seguirsi nella loro interezza e dare pieno frutto solo se uomini di Stato e popoli, datori di lavoro e operai, siano animati dalla fede in un Dio personale, legislatore e vindice, a cui devono rispondere delle loro azioni. Perchè, mentre l'incredulità, che si

deliberations and actions are animated, moved and sustained by a lively sense of responsibility, men who do not refuse to submit to the sacred laws of God. . . .

The devastation of this war is too great for us to add to it the havoc which would result from a frustrated and illusory peace. To avoid such a tragedy there will be needed the sincere, willing, resolute and generous co-operation, not only of this or that party, of this or that people, but of all peoples and of the whole of humanity. This is a universal enterprise for the common good of all, and it requires the collaboration of Christianity for the religious and moral aspects of the new order which it is intended to construct. . . .

The new order which all peoples desire to see established after the trials and devastation of this war must be founded upon the immovable and immutable rock of the moral law, that law which the Creator himself has made known by means of the natural order and which He has engraved in indelible characters on the hearts of men. The observance of this law must be inculcated and promoted by the public opinion of all nations and all states with such unanimity of voice and emphasis that none will dare to question it or to attenuate its binding force. . . .

Within the framework of a new order based upon moral principles, there is no room for the persecution of religion and of the Church. A living faith in a personal and transcendent God is the source of an uncompromising and unyielding moral strength which animates the whole of life. For not only is faith itself a virtue, it is also the divine gate through which all the virtues enter into the temple of the soul, thus building up that strong and tenacious character which does not waver when reason and justice are put to the test.

Regarding the social question in particular, a question which will arise in a more acute form at the end of the war, both Our predecessors and We have set forth norms for its solution. But it is to be remarked that these norms can only be observed in their entirety and produce their full fruit if statesmen and peoples, employers and workers, are animated by faith in a personal God, Lawgiver and Judge, to whom they must render an account of their actions. For, while the

accampa contro Dio, ordinatore dell'universo, è la più pericolosa nemica di un giusto ordine nuovo, ogni uomo, invece, credente in Dio ne è un potente fautore e paladino. Chi ha fede in Cristo, nella sua divinità, nella sua legge, nella sua opera di amore e di fratellanza fra gli uomini, porterà elementi particolarmente preziosi alla ricostruzione sociale; a maggior ragione, più ve ne porteranno gli uomini di Stato, se si dimostreranno pronti ad aprire largamente le porte e spianare il cammino alla Chiesa di Cristo, affinché, libera e senza intralci, mettendo le sue soprannaturali energie a servizio dell'intesa tra i popoli e della pace, possa cooperare col suo zelo e col suo amore all'immenso lavoro di risanare le ferite della guerra. . . .

Scenda (la Nostra benedizione) anche su quelli che, pur non appartenendo al corpo visibile della Chiesa cattolica, sono a Noi vicini per la fede in Dio e in Gesù Cristo, e con Noi concordano sopra l'ordinamento e gli scopi fondamentali della pace.

(A.A.S., xxxiv, 1942, p. 18.)

(14) PIUS XII, *Nuntius Radiophonicus*, 13 May, 1942

infidelity that rebels against God the Ruler of the universe is the most dangerous enemy of a just new order, on the contrary every man who believes in God is a potent promoter and champion of it. He who has faith in Christ, in His divinity, in His law, in His work of love and brotherhood among men, will contribute particularly precious elements to social reconstruction. With even more reason it follows that statesmen will contribute more to that reconstruction if they show themselves ready to open wide the door and smooth the path for the Church of Christ, in order that freely and without hindrance she may place her supernatural energies at the service of international understanding and peace, and collaborate with her zeal and love in the immense task of healing the wounds of war. . . .

May Our Blessing be also upon those who, though not belonging to the visible body of the Catholic Church, are near to Us by their faith in God and in Jesus Christ, and are of one mind with Us concerning the peace settlement and its fundamental aims.

(C.T.S., S. 164, tr. by Canon G. D.-Smith.)

Today, when the separation of so many from the See of Peter weakens the effect of unity, never was there greater need that the prayer "That they may be one" should rise vehemently from the hearts of all those who believe in Christ.

That is the prayer today of many others though they are living outside the visible Church, because they feel, in a world hostile to Christ, that the very existence of Christianity is at stake.

(*Universe*, 15 May, 1942.)

THE WAR DAMAGE ACT AND CATHOLIC CHARITIES

AT the present time heavy taxation and liabilities like the liability to contribution under the War Damage Act and the insurance of movable property (in theory voluntary, but in fact a duty binding on trustees) lay considerable financial burdens on the clergy and others in charge of the property of the Catholic Church. Many questions on the legal position and status of the Catholic Church in England and Wales are inevitably being raised. Some of the effects of recent legislation appear unduly burdensome, some seem even unfair. What is more perplexing still to the inexperienced is that methods by which real grievances are in practice usually remedied often appear to be as anomalous as the grievances themselves. Some of this is perhaps due to an incomplete realization by Catholics of their own true legal position. It might help a little if an explanation of this could be provided in quite untechnical language, no attempt being made to lay down wide ecclesiastico-political principles or to discuss details of English Law, still less to decide on particular problems arising out of the War Damage Act.

Catholics ought to realize in the first place that their difficulties are not due to any discrimination against members of the Catholic and Roman Church. Similar problems exist in England for every religious society. For the Church of England they appear to be far more complicated. Anyone who has read Cecilia Ady's book *The English Church and How it Works*, London, 1940, an extremely competent and instructive account of the status and legal position of the Church of England (but already requiring an appendix on Diocesan Reorganization Committees), written by one who has an exact knowledge of the problems which face the Church Assembly, might well wish that someone equally competent would describe not the theory but the practice of the Catholic and Roman Church in England and Wales. A mind trained in Roman Canon Law finds impossibilities and absurdities in many arrangements which in practice work, or can be made to work. Canonists have in recent years had quite unprecedented scope for their talents in drawing up various schemes first for a *modus vivendi* and then for a concordat between the Holy See and civil governments. They all involve grave internal questions in each State. One wonders how many of these elaborate Concordats really work.

It is quite certain in any case that an English judge who had little knowledge of or interest in the actual machinery by which the Catholic and Roman Church in England really carries out its religious duties would learn very little about actual practice by taking up the study of the Code of Canon Law. He would be in the same position as was Lord Halsbury when he had to give attention to the Westminster Confession of Faith in order to deal with litigious Scottish Presbyterians who appeared before him. He would probably express equally strange opinions. He would

certainly ask some awkward questions. For example, he would want to know whether a Roman Catholic is simply defined as a person who professes spiritual obedience to the Pope, or whether a Roman Catholic trust founded, let us say, in 1850 existed for the purpose of propagating the doctrine contained in the decrees of the Council of Trent and other dogmatic definitions up to that date. He would ask whether a trust could in *English Law* add to its objects the teaching of the Decrees of the Council of the Vatican or any other later definition. That is certainly the way in which the English legal mind appears to work.

The Roman Catholic Church in England and Wales—to give it the description it would presumably have if it had any legal existence, and without any wish to modify our normal description of ourselves—has no theoretical legal position or status at all. As a Church it has no legal unity; it is not a corporation, it is not a registered company, it is not a single unified trust. What status it has belongs to its individual members or officials and their private associations. A Roman Catholic Bishop has a status. He is in episcopal orders recognized as valid by the Church of England and so indirectly by the State. A Roman Catholic deacon or priest or bishop is a clerk in Holy Orders. As such he may not be a member of the House of Commons. We regard sub-deacons also as being in Holy Orders, but there are no sub-deacons in English Law. A disqualification confers status. A nonconformist minister has no status in this sense, and he may sit in the House of Commons. Of course a Roman Catholic Bishop or priest or deacon, if a peer, is thereby a member of the House of Lords. Many statutes and constant practice confer a status on Roman Catholic men and women. They are recorded as Roman Catholics when in the Services or in prison or in a municipal hospital or public institution. They, like other non-Anglicans, have some exemptions; for example, from certain compulsory religious services, and from any compulsory non-Catholic religious education. There are particular disqualifications: a Roman Catholic owner of the presentation to an Anglican benefice may not present a candidate, while a nonconformist or Mohammedan or atheist could legally present a candidate. Disqualification again confers status.

All these legal disabilities and legal rights appear to be personal. They are mainly determined by reference to the Church of England. They would exist in law even if there were no organized Roman Catholic Church in England and Wales; exemptions and disabilities of lay men and women would exist even if we had no bishops and no priests in England.

The Roman Catholic Church in England and Wales is in law a vast and highly complicated congeries of trusts. As soon as that has been said the reason for restricting the subject to England and Wales is obvious. The Law of Trusts in Scotland differs in important ways and that has inevitable consequences.

There is a historical reason why this kind of problem has been discussed a good deal from the point of view of the Law of Scotland. The problem became acute when Lord Halsbury in the House of Lords, in a famous appeal by the Free Church of Scotland, refused to recognize a Church as such and said that the Law of England could only deal with a trust or a registered company and not with a religious society as such. For some years after 1905 there were discussions of this attitude. One of the best known is the book by Dr. J. N. Figgis, *Churches in the Modern State*, London, 1913. It is only moderately helpful from the Roman Catholic point of view, but it fully expressed the dissatisfaction of any religious society at being regarded merely as a charitable trust. In general, Roman Catholic trusts have been successful in avoiding litigation of the kind which has on more than one occasion excited strong feelings in Scotland. When public opinion is really aroused the Law-Courts cease to be a suitable tribunal; no remedy but Parliamentary action is possible. The best means of securing religious liberty is the practice of mutual Christian charity among ourselves.

There is no theoretical reason in law why there should not be one large central trust entitled, let us say, The Roman Catholic Trust for England and Wales. We need not consider this suggestion or mention obvious internal difficulties. It is far too remote from actual fact. It is, however, a possibility, and if it were realized such a trust could go on to ask for incorporation by approaching Parliament and so could receive the status which incorporation confers. Other organized religious societies in England and Wales have been developing along these lines. Their affairs are no business of ours, but their experiences might well be studied by Roman Catholics. We have much to learn.

Actual fact is very different. The trusts which make up the elusive entity we have called the Roman Catholic Church in England and Wales, an entity quite recognizable by ourselves, yet non-existent in a law-court, are numerous and complex. We have taken full advantage of the law of trusts. There are holding trusts and sub-trusts, declared or implied. A trust can convey its property to itself and hold that property for a more specialized or limited purpose. There are surprising possibilities and most possibilities have at one time or another been realized.

While penal laws were a reality and when taxation was only moderately burdensome much Roman Catholic property was held by individuals or by trustees on implied trusts. Nothing further was necessary or possible. In recent times urgent economic reasons compel trustees to attempt to establish their claim to be holders of a *charitable* trust. Most Roman Catholic trusts are charitable, some are not. The financial effects of this difference are serious.

The idea of a charitable trust is quite special, and it has a long history in English Law. The present position can be seen in §39 (2) of the War Damage Act 1941, which introduced some new phrases :

"The charitable purposes to which this section applies are charitable purposes of any of the following kinds, that is to say,

- (a) the relief of poverty ;
- (b) the making of provision for the cure or mitigation or prevention of, or for the care of persons suffering from or subject to, any disease or infirmity or disability affecting human beings (including the care of women before, during and after childbirth) ;
- (c) the advancement of religion ;
- (d) the advancement of education, learning, science or research."

Now Roman Catholic charities include all of these objects and many individual charities combine two or more. But certain Roman Catholic associations are ineligible. There are historical reasons for this.

There can be no doubt that in Elizabethan times, to which we must go if we are to understand the legal term "charity", the term "religion" meant the worship of the Church of England according to the Book of Common Prayer and the teaching of doctrine in accordance with the Thirty-nine Articles. The "advancement of religion" would include activities like sermons, public worship, teaching the Prayer-book Catechism and so on ; it meant *and still means* an activity directed towards others. The idea of propaganda seems to be inherent in it. The term "religion", however, has been extended by statute to include nonconformists, and afterwards Roman Catholics received a status similar to theirs. This is not the place to discuss whether any religion whatever could be included under the term "advancement of religion". One can easily conceive a quasi-religious group or association failing to make good its claim, and preferring another method of association, e.g. a registered company, rather than having a doubtful or unsatisfactory status as a charitable trust.

But one thing is certain. A group of devout persons who live in one house and who meet privately to hold a prayer-meeting or recite the Psalter and who do not hold public services or engage in a public activity are not in English Law "advancing religion". They may be endeavouring to deepen their own spiritual life. But so long as they are not advancing religion *in others* their activity is not charitable. That is why a convent of contemplative nuns cannot hold property under the Roman Catholic Charities Act. The position of Roman Catholic contemplative monks who are priests is more obscure. It would appear to be true that the saying of Mass even privately has been held to be a charity ; and a contemplative monk saying Mass in a chapel open to the public is unquestionably "advancing religion" in the legal sense.

The discrimination in law between active and contemplative convents appears to Roman Catholics anomalous. Nevertheless its economic effects are to some extent neutralized by a number of concessions of no statutory value but of great importance in fact ; to some extent, but not in all cases,

and in particular not under the War Damage Act. The remedy appears to us to be as anomalous as the grievance. But it is necessary to emphasize that this state of affairs is not in any way whatever a relic of penal laws or due to any discrimination against Roman Catholics or against convents or against the enclosed life in religion. It depends on the English law of property and on the definition of "charity". This legal conception is fundamental in its nature and could not easily be altered without far-reaching effects. An English judge in his official capacity is unaware of the existence of convents and knows nothing about enclosed contemplative nuns. But he is extremely interested in the trustees who hold their property.

The War Damage Act introduced a new term. In addition to "charitable purposes", we find "ecclesiastical purposes" mentioned in §39. It is hard to say just what this means. But as the congeries of trusts which we think of as the Roman Catholic Church is not in law a "Church" at all, nor is any individual trust, even a diocesan trust, a Church, it is hard to see how any of its purposes could be described as "ecclesiastical". Presumably this term includes only certain activities of the Church of England. Until it has been further defined we cannot say more. It certainly was originally inserted in the Act to meet particular Anglican problems. It would appear to be true that English law presumes, rightly as every Roman Catholic believes, that there can be only *one* Church. We differ in our identification of that one Church. All other "Churches" in English law are voluntary associations of those who dissent from or refuse to conform to the one Church of England. They are not Churches. It may seem paradoxical to say that none of the activities of a Roman Catholic cathedral or abbey are "ecclesiastical"; that they are merely "charitable and for the advancement of religion". This however seems to be true.

The practical results of the legal position of Roman Catholic associations as charitable trusts are very far-reaching. All legislation must deal with associations recognized by law. There can normally be no "denominational" legislation and no "ecclesiastical" legislation in England except for the Church of England. A Roman Catholic trust, e.g. a convent, must be assimilated to all other trusts which may have no religious purposes or objects at all. The religious purposes may give the trust a status as a charitable trust, but the internal organization of a religious order cannot normally be considered in English law. This is even more true of Roman Canon Law. If there were one central Roman Catholic Trust a law court might ask for information as to its internal rules—just as a law-court could ask for information as to the conditions of membership of a club if a member protested in a law-court against modification in subscription or against expulsion—but in actual fact the Roman Catholic Church has no legal unity, and our own Canon Law could hardly be quoted for reference purposes in an English law-court even in the sense of a voluntary code of rules obeyed by the members of a religious association. A very practical result at the present time is that the War Damage Commission must make

regulations which cover simultaneously *all* charitable trusts, e.g. voluntary hospitals and at the same time monasteries. Both are simply charitable trusts.

There is another consequence which may not be immediately relevant but ought to be stated. Non-Catholic denominations have learned by bitter experience that all plans for what is generally called "corporate reunion"—i.e. the amalgamation of two or more religious bodies into one—involve such delicate questions concerning the obligations of trustees that nothing but a special Act of Parliament can safeguard trustees from accusations of breach of trust. Yet it is surprising how seldom this absolutely dominating legal consideration is mentioned by enthusiasts for "Christian Reunion", even by those most anxious for the so-called "spiritual independence" of a religious body and its freedom from state control. Complete freedom from state control is impossible; the state controls all property-holders, and much of the spiritual work of a Church would be extremely restricted if permanent church buildings could not be owned by someone on behalf of a religious society. The only spiritual independence really possible is strictly limited, and is largely based on the absence of internal disputes in any religious society. Any appeal to a law-court would at once show how limited spiritual independence is.

It is not easy for a Roman Catholic to think of the Catholic Church in the way in which it would be considered by judges in the House of Lords; but it is worth while to try to do so. The effort would help to explain many things. Even wide questions like the relations between England and the Holy See, so often ignorantly discussed as if they were purely political or as if they depended mainly on alleged religious prejudices, cannot be understood without a considerable knowledge of the principles of English Law and in particular of the English Law of Trusts. And it is absolutely indispensable for any intelligent criticism of the War Damage Act and for attempts to obtain any relief or remedy for particular hardships.

WILLIAM JAMES ANDERSON.

HOMILETICS

The Tenth Sunday after Pentecost

"O God be merciful to me a sinner."

OUR Lord, usually so gentle in His utterances, even in His protests, was unsparing in His epithets when speaking to or of the Pharisees. He who said "Suffer little children to come unto me" called these men fools,

hypocrites, blind guides, whited sepulchres, serpents, vipers. Such attacks must have shocked the disciples. To them the Pharisees were the revered guardians of divine law and order, the learned interpreters of Moses and the Prophets. Their conduct set the standard for the Jews. They kept every jot and tittle of the ordinances, fasted and tithed more than was ordered, lavished alms and prayed constantly. Their very aloofness appeared austere, saintly.

But the Master, Who knew the heart, saw the rottenness behind the façade of holiness. These men were serious obstacles to His work, the saving of souls. Their learning was used for a casuistry which made void the commandments. With a parade of omniscience they gave iniquitous decisions about matters of grave importance, about marriage, honour due to parents, the keeping of the Sabbath and vows. In their worldly wisdom and prudence, they had blinded themselves by sinning against the light. About the two great commandments upon which depended the whole law and the prophets they knew little or nothing. They honoured God with their lips only; they treated their fellow men as beasts of burden and grew rich at their expense. They used their privileged position to spread, with the venom of the old serpent, spiritual disease and death. The disciples themselves were not wholly free from the poison, as is shown by Our Lord's addressing this parable to "some who trusted in themselves as just and despised others".

The picture is a masterpiece in miniature; so much is seen in so small a compass. The background of the Temple throws the two characters into relief. The Pharisee stands in arrogant dignity. In his own opinion he is already one of the elect; he looks down from his fool's paradise with pre-eminent self-satisfaction upon the sinful world beneath. There is no thought of thanking God for help, no cry for forgiveness. Worst of all he is totally unconscious of his dreadful state, dazzled with his own excess of light. The tax-gatherer keeps his distance from the holy man of God, stands humbly, eyes to the ground, beats his breast in sorrow for sin, and pleads for mercy. The mercy of God descends swiftly upon him, irresistibly drawn by the humble cry of distress: "O God be merciful." That very moment the poor sinner was received into the kingdom of light. The other, the thing of darkness, whose works were dark, remained in the exterior darkness, without sorrow, without remorse.

The parable is a serious warning to us, to Christians everywhere. At all costs we must remain humble. There is no other way into the Kingdom. We may fulfil our external religious duties to the edification of our brethren, attend Holy Mass and Benediction with fidelity and outward devotion, take a prominent part in parochial organizations, carry out a multiplicity of pious practices, fast and give alms, and yet not be pleasing in God's sight. This, thank God, is not likely, but it is possible. Pious frauds have existed in all ages. They have lacked that which makes a man admit sincerely his sinfulness. There is no surer touchstone of holiness than humility. When everything else has failed, this has revealed vice under the disguise of virtue. Unless we can say with conviction the prayer of the Publican our religion is an empty show.

Pride is hateful to God and man. Man resents its arrogance, feels the injustice of being treated as an inferior by a fellow man, and so is pleased

o see him humbled. Pride is much more odious when, as in the case of the Pharisee, it is accompanied with a show of holiness. It is hateful to God because by it man puts himself in the place of God, looks upon himself as being the source of his own goodness. His sufficiency is from himself. He cannot say with conviction: "O God be merciful to me a sinner."

We ought, therefore, to hate pride, not only in its extreme form, but in any form. It predisposes us to all sin, and especially to vanity and rash judgement. To detect it in its subtler workings we need special grace. One of the best ways of obtaining this grace is to repeat constantly: "O God be merciful to me a sinner."

Humility, on the contrary, is lovable to God and men. To men because they feel that it makes the whole world kin; the humble man is a companion, one of themselves, who walks the dusty earth with them. God loves this virtue because by it man puts himself in his proper place and keeps himself there, acknowledges his absolute dependence upon Him, his unworthiness to receive benefits, his sinfulness and sins. It is specially lovable to God when it is joined with a childlike love. He stoops to such souls and lifts them up, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven. The prayer of the Publican will deepen our humility and love, and so will draw down God's mercy and love upon us.

8

The Eleventh Sunday after Pentecost

"They besought him that he would lay his hand on him."

One of the outstanding features of Our Lord's miraculous cures was their suddenness. The multitudes flocked round Him wherever He went, and their sick in the streets so that His garments might touch them. "And He healed them." To have healed such numbers gradually would have taken untold hours. The instantaneous cure was calculated to produce a deep impression, to rouse religious enthusiasm to a higher pitch, and to dispose the mind to give an immediate assent to His power and doctrine. A few miracles, however, were worked slowly; at least they were surrounded by actions which held up the final effect. Such was the case of the man born blind. Our Lord led him by the hand out of the town, touched his eyes with spittle, and laid hands upon him. The man at first saw "men as it were trees walking", then saw clearly. In today's Gospel we are told how He takes the deaf and dumb man away from the crowd, puts His fingers into his ears, touches his tongue with spittle, looks up to heaven, sighs, and utters the word "Ephpheta", "Be opened".

While the full significance of these and similar cases is not evident, we may presume that the ritualistic acts were meant to help the person who was being cured. The deaf and dumb man could at least see, and so was enabled to understand something of the nature of the favour about to be conferred. He must have guessed it, too, from the kind manner of Our Lord in taking his hand. The Physician, in putting His fingers into the ears, got at the source of the evil. The man was dumb only because he was deaf. He could make those rudimentary sounds which in young children and the dumb take the place of speech. The saliva signified the source of the cure;

virtue went out from the Physician Himself; the effects of sin (for physical ills are ultimately from sin) were washed away at the fountain-head of all grace; humanity was healed at the touch of the divinity. Although all power in Heaven and earth had been given to Him by the Father, yet He always acted with His Father. He and the Father were one. As though to emphasize this truth, He had on several solemn occasions lifted up His eyes to Heaven. The action now would direct the man's own gaze and thoughts heavenwards. Whatever good gift was to come to him was to come, not through any earthly or diabolical power, but from above. Martha also saw those eyes thus lifted when the glory of the Father was about to be manifested in the resurrection of her brother Lazarus. Here, too, was a man buried in a tomb of silence, cut off from the land of living thought and intellectual intercourse, shut out from the revelation of God. The voice of God opened those ears so that they might hear the voice of God. From that moment the man spoke right, giving glory to God.

The bodily ills mentioned in the Gospel have their spiritual counterparts; bodily death symbolizes spiritual death. The case of the deaf-mute well illustrates the spiritual state of the unbaptized. In fact the Church has borrowed several actions used by Our Lord on this occasion, for the rite of baptism. She has even retained the word itself "Ephpheta". But perhaps the best parallel is with the unbaptized adults among the primitive races. These can see created things, and so come to some knowledge of the Creator; they can utter some kind of rudimentary prayer. But they cannot know the revelation of God, they cannot hear the gentle voice of Christ in the Church, because there is no one to pierce their deafness. "How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? Or how shall they believe him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher?" (Romans x, 14).

We have a strict duty to help missionary labours by our prayers and good works. Whatever we do for the most ignorant, the most degenerate of mankind, is taken by Our Lord to be done to Him. "As long as you do it to the least of these my brethren you did it to me" (Matthew xxv, 40). When the friends of the deaf-mute begged the Master to lay hands on him, they were doing a favour to the Master Himself, by making His power manifest and by causing the man and those who witnessed the cure to give glory to God. Let us therefore with a like charity and zeal beg this same Master through His missionary priests to lay His hands in blessing upon the heathen so that they may come soon to the knowledge of the Gospel and praise and bless His holy name.

The Twelfth Sunday after Pentecost

"But a certain Samaritan . . . was moved with compassion."

The picture of the Good Samaritan has become a classical illustration of goodness to others. The very term has passed into ordinary speech to describe the friend in need, one who is always ready to relieve distress. We may learn from today's Gospel how to bless goodness no matter where it is found. The Samaritans were not the chosen people. They had

wandered from the truth, and by mixing too freely with the Gentiles had themselves to some extent become idolaters. They had built a rival temple and were bitterly hostile to the Jews. The very journey which Our Lord was making had been considerably lengthened because they had refused Him a passage through their country. Yet Our Lord chooses a Samaritan to be a model of charity while a priest and a Levite of His own race are presented as sinning against it. The priest and the Levite were coming from Jerusalem, the centre of the Jewish religion; they were filled with the holiness of the holy city; they were clean, in their own estimation, before God and man. The plight of the unfortunate traveller did not move them. Rather they found him repulsive and stepped aside. Their hands were holy; must not be soiled. Their duties were for the Temple, not for man, as though the positive law excluded the natural. They saw their brother and loved him not. One could apply to them what was written later by St. John: "If any man say: 'I love God', and hateth his brother, he is a liar. For he that loveth not his brother whom he seeth, how can he love God whom he seeth not?" (1 John iv, 20.)

The genuine goodness of the stranger is seen in every detail: he goes up to the wretched man; is moved to pity; cleanses his wounds with wine, soothes them with oil, binds them up; and then lifts him on his mule; takes him to a house of shelter; tends him; pays for him; asks the innkeeper to be good to him; and promises to meet all further expenses. This was goodness after Our Lord's own heart, typical of His own attitude, in spite of many rebuffs, towards His people. His compassion for the stricken multitudes, the blind, the lame, the lepers, the deaf, His mercy on the poor and sinful were well known throughout the country. While priests and levites passed by indifferent, He was moved to compassion by the spiritual plight of the people; He cleansed and soothed their wounds. Yet the Pharisees would not give Him credit for any good work. He was as a foreigner, a stranger among them. Worse than this, He was a blasphemer doing the devil's work. "Do not we say well that thou art a Samaritan and hast a devil?" (John viii, 48.) He was appealing to them to believe at least in the goodness of His works even if they refused to believe in His claims. It would be a beginning at any rate. If He was to them a Samaritan, at least He was a good Samaritan.

We can see a great deal of good around us if we look for it. Our Lord did not discuss the motives of the Samaritan, whether they were natural or supernatural. He simply pointed out the deed as a good and neighbourly act. Unless we have definite proof to the contrary we ought to assume the rightness of motive, and, if there is a doubt, to give the benefit of the doubt. During these times of stress, we have had many opportunities of blessing God for the countless heroic actions performed by our fellow men of all classes and creeds. We can make use of their example to urge ourselves and others to greater and more willing service. In a non-Catholic country it is inevitable that most of the heroes are not of the fold, but God's grace is abounding. Let us extol the sacrifice and leave the motive to God.

Again, the principal organizations for the relief of the sick, the suffering, the prisoners of war, are of non-Catholic origin. We should seize these opportunities of neighbourly co-operation. Let us not sully our sympathy by assuming mere humanitarian feelings and motives. Without some

Christian ideals such beneficent movements would not live. In any case it is our duty to bless what is good and to make it better if we can. These movements spring at least from the natural law which God has written in the very hearts of men. Many of our generous countrymen know little about Revelation as such, but they "do by nature those things that are the law . . . they show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness to them" (Rom. ii, 15). Let us bless God for this much, and co-operate with it. Here we have a common ground where we can work together with a will. We find ourselves together by the side of the good Samaritan because we have the same ideas about outrage and injustice, whether to individuals or to nations. In a world where cruel and lawless leaders would rob individuals and nations of their God-given inheritance, we are compelled to band together to safeguard the common decencies and rights of man. The Church has constantly lifted up her voice against violations of those rights. Of recent years the great social encyclicals have pleaded for the observance of the natural law. The present Holy Father has again pleaded for it in his basis for peace. He has called for the co-operation, not only of Catholics but of "all noble and generous minds." Let us therefore give a whole-hearted support to all activities and movements which are based upon the recognition of man's moral rights. It would be a great tragedy if, in this hour of suffering humanity, we were considered by our non-Catholic brethren to have "passed by".

Let us find also in these admirable activities an added reason for earnestly supporting our own charities. If many of those who have not the full revelation of God are so merciful, how much more merciful ought we to be who possess it! Do we give a helping hand to our Sisters who tend the sick, the crippled, the suffering, the defective, the orphaned, the poor, the aged and the dying? They are angels of mercy working solely for God. And there are the tender-hearted disciples of Saint Vincent of Paul, who seek in humble silence those who have fallen by the wayside. By blessing and helping such good Samaritans we shall ourselves grow more compassionate towards our neighbour.

The Thirteenth Sunday after Pentecost

"He fell on his face at his feet and thanked him."

Today the Gospel is again about a Samaritan, but this time about a real one who had been attacked by leprosy on the road of life and lay half-dead and who had been healed and then given his place again among his fellow-men. Nine others had cried for pity and had been likewise made whole and they went to show themselves to the priests. Only one returned "glorifying God with a loud voice, and he fell on his face at his feet and thanked him." These are not the actions of a man who returns merely formal thanks. As soon as he saw himself cured his heart was flooded with gratitude. He turned back immediately. When he saw his benefactor he threw himself prostrate in an attitude expressive of profound humility and unutterable gratitude. The heart of the Master thrilled with joy. Yet He could not reflect without sadness upon the ingratitude of the other nine, especially as they were Jew

The only one to return and give glory to God was a foreigner, a Samaritan. Perhaps nothing hurts so much in life as ingratitude. It shows itself in many ways, taking kindness for granted, favours as rights, acknowledging benefits in a cursory manner, even forgetting to say a word of thanks. On this point we are all sensitive because of an instinct for what is right and proper. The incident related in today's Gospel reminds us of our elementary duty to thank people for kindnesses received. We learnt to do so as children. Our "thank you" was a little contribution to the happiness of the family. Men being but "children of a larger growth", and the human family but an extension of our own, we have to bring the music of our thanks to a listening world.

Much more ought we to thank God for His countless favours bestowed upon us so lavishly and so lovingly. The gift of life with its powers of sense, intellect and will; the gift of the supernatural life with its graces; the great rivers of grace, the sacraments, and especially the Blessed Eucharist; these as well as many other blessings must call from us our deep gratitude. As leprosy often represents sin, we can see in the grateful leper the soul of one cleansed from sin, especially mortal sin. The Sacrament of Penance is too easily taken for granted. The penitent can satisfy himself with a casual word of thanks as though he had received what he could claim by right. Yet God has worked a wonder for him. The cleansing of sin, even venial sin, is a greater thing than the curing of leprosy, or the raising of Lazarus. Yet we continue unmoved on our way as though nothing special had happened. Do we make a heartfelt thanksgiving after even one confession in ten? The Samaritan with his face in the dust and the sad words on Our Lord's lips ought to move us to a genuine sorrow for our ingratitude.

Besides these manifest favours there are those hidden ones which only love can see, minute as the texture of flowers or of snowflakes, the exquisite filigree of God's workmanship which underlies even the tiniest events. You feel well rewarded when a child expresses joy at your tiny presents, your little attentions. So too God is pleased when we express joy at His smallest gifts and arrangements. Some of His followers have become saints by repeating "Deo Gratias". The Spirituality of St. Teresa of Lisieux might be described as "the Art of Thanking God". Whatever came into her life she welcomed lovingly as a personal gift from God. The pleasant, the unpleasant, the dreadful trials which beset her, were so many occasions of thanking her heavenly Father. Let us do likewise so far as our love allows, "giving thanks to God the Father always for all things in the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ" (Eph. v, 20.)

The Fourteenth Sunday after Pentecost

"Be not solicitous."

Many of the Jews were so intent upon earthly glory that they overlooked the glory of God. Instead of making the spiritual life their chief concern they were engrossed in the life of the body with its interests, comforts, and perishable possessions. God had lavished wealth and property upon

the chosen people; the Promised Land overflowed with milk and honey; but the Jews had grown gross-minded. They had turned their eyes from the hands of the Giver and fixed them greedily upon the gifts. The gifts became the measure of God's blessing. Blessed were the rich, the prosperous. The Master was to correct these ideas.

Already on Sinai amid thunder and lightning the Lawgiver had proclaimed that there were to be no false gods. Our Lord sitting now in familiar converse upon the pleasing hill-side showed that worldly possessions could alienate the heart from God. To have one's whole interest in them was to worship them, to make them gods. The disciples had to choose between God and Mammon as definitely as they had to choose between true and false worship. True worship brought true peace. False worship brought false peace. In its train came countless cares and fears: the thief seemed always near; the moth was already eating into their precious garments. "Therefore I tell you, be not solicitous for your life what you shall eat, nor for your body what you shall put on." True worship meant full confidence in the Heavenly Father.

It would be a serious mistake to imagine from today's Gospel that solicitude about temporal matters is wrong. It is the duty of man to work; he is obliged by prudence and piety to make proper provision for himself and for those dependent upon him. Our Lord himself used a purse for money. He declared that man foolish who set about building a tower or making a war without having first carefully worked out whether he had sufficient men or materials to do so (Luke xiv, 28). Careless thinking on this point would produce a mentality at variance with that of the Teacher. We should have to say: "Blessed are the indolent, the improvident, the happy-go-lucky." What Our Lord condemned of course was the solicitude which is wrong, wrong because misplaced. It does not befit a disciple of Christ to be always worrying about material things. Let him use the things of the world as a means to an end. A certain amount of detachment is therefore necessary. We must be willing to give up whatever impedes the supernatural life. When a particular food disagrees with us, we sacrifice it, if we are wise, so that our bodily life may retain its vigour. We ought to act similarly for the sake of our souls. This detachment makes us free. It frees us from over-solicitude.

It is possible to be over-solicitous even about spiritual matters by multiplying good works at the expense of prayer. Outward activities have to be measured by prayer, otherwise one loses a sense of proportion and gives to them an importance which they do not possess. We are inclined with Martha to be troubled about many things. The Lord has no need of our work. He seeks our hearts. Having given them to Him by constant and earnest prayer, we should carry out what comes to hand without over-eagerness or bustle. We can be over-anxious, too, about our spiritual life, wondering too much about how we stand in God's sight, whether He has forgiven our past sins, whether our merit is growing, whether we are making proper progress, whether we shall reach Heaven. Such questionings and misgivings are vain and expose us to many unnecessary temptations. He Who has care of the birds and the flowers has care of us. We are of more value than they; we are in safe keeping. The ground of our security is not the number of our merits or our position on

the spiritual ladder but the infinitely loving mercy of God. He will save us for the sake of His mercy. In the thought of that limitless mercy we can cast all our care upon Him (I Peter, v, 7).

FRANCIS TURNER.

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

ASCETICAL AND MYSTICAL THEOLOGY

OUR *Lady of Wisdom*, by Maurice Zundel,¹ deserves to head the list of recent books. The author is already known to English readers by *The Splendour of the Liturgy*, a study of the mystery of the Mass as a revelation of God's universal activity of Love, directed to the individual soul, and drawing it to a corresponding complete surrender of love. In this new book he considers Our Lady in her various states, to use a word beloved of the Bérullians. He works on the theme that "the Blessed Virgin will be seen as the fullest realization, in the created order, of interiority of life in poverty according to the spirit".

Briefly, his line of thought is this. The heart and soul of the spiritual life is to have familiar intercourse with the Holy Trinity dwelling within the depth of the spirit. But the Sacred Trinity may be described as an Altruism; for each Person is, in theological language, an "Esse Ad". Hence the created life with and in God must be altruistic. It must be a making-over of oneself to Him. Therein lies the love of benevolence, true friendship with God. Therein too lies true Wisdom, which is, in Hedley's phrase, "to live and act for God alone, and to use all knowledge and skill and art to the very utmost, according to time and circumstance, in God's interests". Such intense love and pure wisdom presuppose a corresponding relinquishment of the merely created for the sake of the Creator; and that is detachment, or, to use the author's more expressive word, poverty of spirit. It is the other side of spiritual altruism.

Zundel shows how Divine Wisdom and poverty were supreme in Our Lady's life. They meet in her marriage to St. Joseph, in her maternity, in her silence and compassion, and in the dogmas which tell of her life in the Church. The author works out his theme with a fine insight into the things of the spirit. He is a theologian and a mystic with the imagination of a poet. His short book must be read to be appreciated; no analysis could do it justice.

Follow Me, by Rev. Bernard Fennelly, C.S.Sp.,² is a comprehensive

¹ Translated by F. J. Sheed. (Sheed & Ward. Pp. xii + 103. 5s.) The book has five beautiful reproductions of famous Madonnas.

² Burns Oates & Washbourne Ltd. Pp. xviii + 203. 6s.

study of the vows of religion. It deals with them not merely from the canonical, but also from the ascetical and spiritual standpoint; and thus explains fully what they impose in the way of restriction of liberty and what they call for from the soul by way of gift and dedication of itself in love to God. Hence Fr. Fennelly discusses fully the nature of each vow and of its corresponding virtue and shows how both virtue and vow are meant to be a means and method of seeking and finding God. This is a book very much to be recommended to all those who have to do with the training of religious. Fr. Edward Leen, whose own books on the spiritual life have contributed to the enrichment of our ascetical libraries, writes an excellent introduction, setting forth the true purpose of religion. In every case it is to unite the soul to God. After that it is to direct the soul's energies to work for other souls, and that work may be the hidden activity of prayer and suffering of the contemplative or the outward activity of good works of the so-called active religious. For these latter Fr. Leen has a special, timely word of warning, lest they subordinate the spiritual life to the social purpose for which they have been called into being and thus become content with promptitude, diligence and external discipline in their subjects, because these qualities make for temporal efficiency, thereby losing sight of the "better gifts" which unite the soul to God and supernaturalize its work for others. The present book, with its continued insistence on the primacy of the virtue of charity and union with God, will act as a prophylactic and corrective of such tendencies. But that is merely its negative value. Positively, it is a fine piece of spiritual as well as canonical writing, which brings out the grandeur and nobility of the religious life. Fr. Fennelly shows himself to be a true continuator of the traditions of his friend, the late Fr. Kearney.

Prayer for All Men, by Pierre Charles, S.J.,¹ is a series of thirty-three meditations on a theme which the author has made very much his own, namely the extension of the Church universally and the need for Catholics to see and work and pray for the entire world as Christ's kingdom. "Can we be selfish even in prayer?" asks the Archbishop of Birmingham in his Foreword. "It seems that we can, and indeed we often are, for we focus our prayer too much on our own needs, which although undoubtedly important to ourselves are trivial in comparison with the needs of the Church, the Bride of Christ. We want to learn to think and feel about things as Christ Our Lord thinks and feels about them." This little book of simple colloquies, rising from the ordinary to the transcendent, will help us to do this. If the translator falters at times, he seems on the whole to remain very true to his original and to have caught the spirit and simple earnestness of his author.

Our Lady's Hours, by Mary Ryan, M.A.,² is a simple, scholarly and devotional study of the Little Office of Our Lady. Professor Ryan comments mainly on the Dominican Rite, but adds to it a short commentary on the Roman Rite.

Prayer with Mary, by Rev. J. Leo McGovern,³ is a series of Holy Hours

¹ Translated by Rev. F. J. Sumner. (Sands. Pp. 143. 5s.)

² The Forum Press, Cork. Pp. xvi + 118. 2s. 6d.

³ Sands. Pp. 116. 4s. 6d.

in union with Our Lady. The themes are : The Mother of God ; Mother of Sorrows ; The Joys of Mary ; Mary, Mediatrix of Grace ; Mary, Refuge of Sinners ; Mary, Help of Christians. Certain standard prayers for use with the Hours are given in an appendix. The meditations follow the method of St. Ignatius in a general way ; they group the thoughts round a central scene, and associate a particular grace with each consideration. They are simple and direct in conception and pleasingly written, and will assuredly help souls to understand Our Lady better and themselves better, and will, as the author hopes, bring consolation to many in these times of distress.

The Rosary in Daily Life, by Rev. Bruno Walkley, O.P.,¹ is a book of reflections on the mysteries of the Rosary. The Rosary must be meditated, if one wishes to enter into its true spirit and gain the generous indulgences attached to it. Here we are given the requisite meditations with the personal application of the matter which all good meditation should have. And, as a general theme, we are shown how the Rosary will help to build up the life of virtue in the soul, inspiring Faith through the Joyful Mysteries, Charity through the Sorrowful Mysteries, and Hope through the Glorious Mysteries. This is a most opportune and helpful book.

J. CARTMELL.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

MASS OBLIGATIONS

The contributions of the faithful placed, at the parish priest's invitation, in the Holy Souls Box have been stolen. Is the parish priest bound in principle to get the Masses said ? If so, how many ? Could the obligation be discharged when saying the second Mass on days when duplication is permitted ? (S.)

REPLY

Canon 824, §2 : Quoties autem pluries in die celebrat, si unam Missam ex titulo iustitiae applicet, sacerdos . . . pro alia eleemosynam recipere nequit.

Canon 829 : Licet sine culpa illius qui onere celebrandi gravatur, Missarum eleemosynae iam perceptae perierint, obligatio non cessat.

¹ Burns Oates & Washbourne Ltd. Pp. xii + 84. 2s. 6d.

It was commonly taught before the Code, e.g. by Gasparri, *D. Eucharistia*, n. 588, that the obligation ceased if the Mass offering was stolen or lost through no fault of the priest, and this may still be held in regard to foundation Masses when the capital has disappeared through no fault of the trustee. It is now certain, from canon 829, that in the case of manual Masses the obligation does not cease: *res perit domino*; no matter what theory is held concerning the nature of the Mass offering, the priest who has accepted it is regarded as the owner and the loss is his. Nevertheless, we think that in the circumstances of the above case equity demands that a way should be discovered for releasing the parish priest from the full rigour of the law, and it may be done in two ways.

(i) It could be held, indeed, with plausibility that the priest has not actually received (*perceptae*) the offerings until he has emptied the box. "Vi enim perceptionis stipendiorum," writes Cappello, *De Sacramentis*, I, n. 679, "et non antea, perficitur contractus inter celebrantem et oblatorem". Whilst lying in the box the offerings are in process of reaching him, in rather the same way as they would be if sent by any other channel.

On the other hand, he has charge of the box and they are placed therein at his invitation. If, as is likely in some cases, he intends himself to say these Masses, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that he is the owner of the contents of the box, and that he is consequently bound by the law of canon 829. He could, of course, seek condonation from the persons who made the offerings, or from the Holy See, but this is scarcely worth while for what is a relatively small sum. Having therefore decided that he is bound to say the Masses or get the obligation discharged by other priests, he could lawfully, in our opinion, use *epikeia*, and either say the Masses when duplicating—which is normally forbidden by canon 824, §2; or get them said at a reduced stipend—which is normally forbidden by canon 840, §1. The number to be said can only be decided on a rough estimate from what the box usually contains, or from what is expected on a special occasion.

(ii) In many churches, however, it is customary for the parish priest to get these Masses said by other priests, and the offerings of the faithful are invited and accepted on this understanding; he does not undertake to burden himself with them either expressly or by implication. We think that, in these circumstances, quite a strong case can be made for the view that the parish priest is not the owner but merely the bailee (*depositarius* or *mandatarius*) of the contents of the box. In English law a bailee is not answerable if goods are stolen through no fault of his own, and the same must be said, in principle, of canon law. Cf. d'Annibale, *Theologia Moralis*, II, n. 524. An exception in favour of Mass stipends might be discerned perhaps, in canon 839, but it can be interpreted as applying to the disposal of offerings which have actually passed into the possession of the person disbursing them. Accordingly, Vermeersch, commenting upon canon 829 in *Theologia Moralis*, III, n. 298.2, writes: "Si autem de eo ageretur quod non foret nisi mandatarius (de quo in can. 837) qui mere stipendia transmittere deberet et nunquam stipendia acquisivisset, is ad nihil teneretur sed stipendia ista casu fortuito apud ipsum periissent. Haec enim patrimonium ipsius non essent ingressa; et obligatio mandati impossibilitate executionis cessare dicenda est."

ARMY CHAPLAINS AND "MISSA PRO POPULO"

Are military chaplains under the obligation of saying the "Missa pro populo" in view of the fact that they are granted the faculties of parish priests in favour of members of the Forces? (P. H.)

REPLY

Canon 451, §2: Parochis aequiparantur cum omnibus iuribus et obligationibus paroecialibus et parochorum nomine in iure veniunt:

(1) Quasi-parochi, qui quasi-paroecias regunt, de quibus in canon 216, §3;

(2) Vicarii paroeciales, si plena potestate paroeciali sint praediti.

§3: Circa militum cappellanos sive maiores sive minores, standum peculiaribus Sanctae Sedis praescriptis.

Some reason for supposing that army chaplains are bound to say the "Missa pro populo" may be deduced from their status, which is equivalent to that of "personal" as distinct from "territorial" parish priests, and the pagella of their faculties states that they are given "facultates omnes paroeciales". Thus Dr. Brys in attempting a definition which will include all who are bound by the obligation writes in *Collationes Brugenses*, 1928, p. 461: "Attamen non qualiscunque cura animarum sufficit ad illam obligationem inducendam, sed illi tantum obligantur qui principaliter et immediate certum populum vi officii sui in spiritualibus regunt, seu omnes qui actu verum officium paroeciale exercent." Before the Code the point was in some dispute, though most canonists, e.g. Many, *De Missa* (1903), n. 90, held that army chaplains were not bound by this obligation. A resolution S.C. *Concilii*, 22 May, 1909, decided that the Spanish military chaplains were not bound, a very full legal text which is the *locus classicus* on the subject.

Our present law is contained in canon 451, §3, on which Cappello, *De Sacramentis* (1938), n. 642, writes: "Num vero parochis aequiparentur, an non, peculiaribus Sanctae Sedis praescripta sunt inspicienda, uti expresse habet cir. can. Quare pro singulis statibus seu nationibus, circa militum cappellanos sive maiores sive minores, standum est peculiaribus Sedis Apostolicae praescriptis. In Italia iurisdictione vere paroeciali fruuntur, at nihilominus Sacrum applicare non tenentur."

We may say the same of our army chaplains as Cappello says of those in Italy: they have parochial jurisdiction but are not bound to say the "Missa pro populo" because there is no reason to suppose, either from their faculties or from any other known document, that the Holy See recognizes the existence of such obligation. There is no doubt that the army chaplains frequently apply Masses for the souls entrusted to their care, but a strict obligation to do so on Sundays and other days named in the law is a burden which requires to be proved; it may not be presumed to exist solely because they enjoy a parish priest's jurisdiction.

TRIPLEX MACHINA

What is the meaning of "triplex machina" in the last verse of the breviary hymn on the feast of the Angel Guardians? (E. O.)

REPLY

"Machina" can have the meaning of "plan" or "scheme", namely, the plan of the whole universe. In the cosmology of the ancients (e.g. Lucretius *De Rerum Natura*, v. 93-97) the universe comprised heaven, earth and the lower regions, an idea reflected in Philipp. ii, 10: "... every knee should bow, of those that are in heaven, on earth, and under the earth". Guéranger in *L'Année Liturgique* accepts this meaning in his version of the Guardian Angels hymn: "ce triple monde, des cieux, de la terre, et de l'abîme", and it is certainly correct, since, as the Editor of this REVIEW points out, a similar phrase occurs in other hymns:

(1) *SS. Angelorum Custodum* (ad Matutinum, v. 3)

Sanctae sit Triadi laus pia iugiter,
Cuius perpetuo numine machina
Triplex haec regitur, cuius in omnia
Regnat gloria saecula.

Praise to the trinal Majesty, whose strength
This mighty fabric sways;
Whose glory reigns beyond the utmost length
Of everlasting days.
(Caswall, W. H. (1916), n. 170.)

(2) *In Ascensione Domini* (ad Matutinum, v. 3)

Ut trina rerum machina,
Coelestium, terrestrium,
Et inferorum condita
Flectat genu iam subdita.

Both heaven and earth, nay, death and hell,
And all in that in their confines dwell,
With bended knees fall down before
The general victor and adore.
(Prime, W. H. (1940), n. 59.)

That so in nature's triple frame
Each heav'nly and each earthly name
And things in hell's abyss abhorr'd
May bend the knee and own him Lord.
(Neale.)

(3) *Commune Festorum B.V.M.* (ad Matutinum, v. 1)

Quem terra, pontus, sidera
Colunt, adorant, praedicant,
Trinam regentem machinam,
Clastrum Mariae bajulat.

Whom earth and seas and starry sky
Adore and worship and declare,
The ruler of the threefold world
The womb of Mary Maid doth bear.
(Martindale, C. T. S., D. 259.)

The God whom earth, and sea, and sky,
Adore and laud and magnify,
Who o'er their threefold fabric reigns,
The virgin's spotless womb contains.
(Neale, W. H. (1940), n. 103.)

(4) *SABBATO in Officio feriali* (ad Matutinum, v. 1)

Summae Parens clementiae,
Mundi regis qui machinam
Unius et substantiae
Trinusque personis Deus :

Father of mercies infinite,
Ruling all things that be,
Who, shrouded in the depth and height,
Art one and yet art three.
(Newman ; cf. Bute, *The Roman Breviary*.)

ad (1). The three constituents correspond roughly to the idea in the three preceding verses. The translator avoids the difficult "triplex".

ad (3). By rendering "pontus" as "the deep" the common meaning of "triplex machina" could be retained.

ad (4). Pimont, *Les Hymnes du Bréviaire Romain* (1874), p. 276, sees an analogy with the Blessed Trinity : one world with three parts.

RECEPTION OF CONVERTS

A priest wishes to receive into the Church a person whom he has instructed who lives in a diocese other than his own, and to receive him in that diocese. When applying for the necessary form must he write direct to the Ordinary (or the Vicar-General), or must his application go through the parish-priest-to-be of the convert? And if the former, has any reference to be made to the parish priest before the reception takes place? (PAROCHUS.)

REPLY

(i) The reconciliation of a convert is not a parochial right but is a matter for the Ordinary of the place where the convert is received. This is apparent from the common law in such canons as 2314, §2, and from the unanimous decision of the English bishops in 1902 : "... idcirco ab Episcopis unanimis, in recenti suo annuo Provinciae Westmonasteriensis Conventu, decumum est ut convertendorum Ecclesiae reconciliationem unusquisque Episcopus in propria sua Dioecesi sibi reservaret".¹ Therefore it is open to any priest, even though he does not belong to the Ordinary's diocese, to apply for the faculty himself without any reference to the future parish priest of the convert.

(ii) Since the matter is wholly within the Ordinary's discretion, it will be found that local regulations determine its details : for example, the Ordinary may require the convert's fitness to be attested by a parish priest, or he may prohibit the reception ceremony to take place anywhere except in a parish church. In such cases, as is evident, the intervention of the parish priest will be a necessary preliminary. Otherwise it will only be necessary to inform the parish priest of the place in order that the details may be inscribed in the parochial register. In practice there should be no difficulty. When the extern priest applies to the Ordinary for a faculty he will be informed of the local law.

E. J. M.

¹*Westminster Diocesan Synod*, XLI (1902), p. 21.

CHURCH MANAGEMENT

SITTINGS AND SEAT RENTS

THE term "sitting", like pew, seems to have acquired a distinctively ecclesiastical significance. It would be interesting to discover how, and by what knowing individual, rents for sittings were first introduced. Protestant influences were most likely responsible. Our mediæval forefathers were content to stand during the offices, or to kneel on the rush-strewn floors, and permanent seating accommodation was only just beginning to find popular favour when the storm broke. The sixteenth century set the fashion which has continued. No doubt the services of the new religion with their long-drawn-out psalm-singing and prolix preaching could not have been endured without the support of benches. Later, high-backed pews secured draught-proof privacy and somnolent inattention for those of the quality who attended church mainly for the praiseworthy purpose of giving good example to the lower orders.

Our predecessors of the Catholic Revival accepted many things as they found them, and seating in church, with the concomitant of seat rents, had then become a national institution. Churches, seatless or sparsely provided with benches, are still common enough in the great Catholic countries of the continent. On a first visit to France or Belgium the devout traveller is often surprised by a poke in the ribs from an old woman who with clutching hand demands her sous "*pour votr' chaise*". One's resentment is softened on learning that in most places the right of the chairs is given by the parish priest to destitute widows. Sometimes the right is farmed out to the highest bidder, after the manner of bathing-tents at a seaside resort.

At home, within living memory, it was customary to charge non-seat-holders for their places at Mass, and this was done by a nicely chosen colour scheme of tickets which corresponded to prices and positions. Nearest the door were the backless benches labelled "Free Seats" or even "Poor".

Happily the poor are no longer treated with indignity, but the ticket system is not yet wholly dead.

Sittings are certainly a subject upon which many of us find it difficult to make up our minds. It is admittedly permissible to charge rents without evading the letter of canon 1181, which is as follows: "*Ingressus in ecclesiam ad sacros ritus sit omnino gratuitus reprobata qualibet contraria consuetudine.*" The question is surely one of propriety. In favour it may be argued that in every parish there will always be a sufficiency of persons whose possessive instinct is so well developed that they prefer to have a seat allotted to them in church and are willing to pay for the privilege. We all of us tend to form a habit of always occupying the same place, so why not acquire proprietorship by payment? Moreover, many persons take sittings for no other motive than that of helping the parochial finances.

On the other hand, seat-holders absorb the best places in church, to the unfair exclusion of others. Sittings are often an occasion of embarrassment to strangers and newcomers. Seat-holders sometimes cause ill-feeling and

uncharitable and disedifying scenes by arriving late and turning out innocent occupants of their sittings. This can be avoided by insisting upon a rule that once the priest has begun the Mass all seats in the church are to be considered free. Then there is the trouble of collecting rents and the unpleasantness of having to deal with those who are in arrears.

No doubt the deciding factor in favour is that seat rents are a source of income which few parishes can afford to forgo. All the same, in a church where, to borrow the phrase beloved of our Anglican brethren, "all seats are free and unappropriated", and the benches undisfigured by rows of names, one has a more lively sense of enjoying the glorious freedom of the sons of God.

J. P. R.

BOOK REVIEW

The Letters of St. Jerome. A Selection to illustrate Roman Christian Life in the Fourth Century. The Latin Text with Introduction and Commentary. By Rev. James Duff, M.A. Pp. viii + 347. (Browne & Nolan. 8s. 6d.)

DESIGNED primarily to provide a text for the University Latin classes at Maynooth, this excellent anthology of St. Jerome's letters can hardly fail to fulfil the editor's hope that it may appeal to a much wider circle of readers. Fr. Duff has spared no labour to make his edition as useful and attractive as possible. Those whose Latin has become rusty will find many a useful hint in the editor's notes, while his Introduction, though originality is modestly disclaimed for it, furnishes an adequate historical background for an appreciative reading of these epistolary gems. In particular the chapter entitled "Christian and Pagan Society" should be carefully studied if one is to assess justly the strictures of Jerome the ascetic upon the manners of his day.

The twenty-five letters which form the collection are admirably chosen to illustrate the many sides of this saintly but complex character. At one moment the hermit delights us as he exchanges reminiscences of his youthful days with a friend; at another he scourges the lascivious habits of contemporary Rome; at another he writes to condole with a mother on the death of her daughter, or with a priest on the death of a promising nephew. Here and there too we are given a taste of his controversial style. Letters of this type take us back to an age in which controversy was conducted with much vigour and little restraint. The disputants were far more concerned about the truth than about the conventions of polite intercourse. The result is an acrimony which sounds strangely in our ears. There is a good deal to be said for the measured calm of our modern methods of discussion which does much to safeguard the claims of charity.

Yet one is tempted to wonder sometimes whether in the concessions which we make to courtesy we do not sacrifice something, I do not say of our conviction, but of our power to convince. It may also be questioned whether the restraint of our times is due any more to a spirit of charity than to a lack of enthusiasm for objective truth.

The letters selected by Fr. Duff deal with a variety of subjects, but readers of this REVIEW will be especially glad to find that he has included St. Jerome's letter to the young priest Nepotianus, a letter which contains advice so suitable for priests of every age and of every land that we cannot forbear quoting some of its axioms here :

On riches :

Ne lucra saeculi in Christi quaeras militia ; ne plus habeas quam quando clericus esse coepisti.

On women :

Omnes puellas et virgines Christi aut aequaliter ignora aut aequaliter dilige.

Solus cum sola secreto et absque arbitrio non sedeas.

On sermons :

Sermo presbyteri scripturarum lectione conditus sit.

Nolo te declamatorem esse et rabulam garrulumque, sed mysterii peritum et sacramentorum Dei tui eruditissimum.

Verba volvere et celeritate dicendi apud imperitum vulgus admirationem sui facere indoctorum hominum est.

On sanctity and learning :

Nec rusticus et tantum simplex frater ideo se sanctum putet, si nihil noverit, nec peritus et eloquens in lingua aestimet sanctitatem ; multoque melius est e duobus imperfectis rusticitatem sanctam habere quam eloquentiam peccatricem.

On dress :

Ornatus et sordes pari modo fugiendae, quia alterum delicias, alterum gloriam redolet.

On visits :

(Ne) alia domus, quid agatur in alia, per te noverit.

Consolutores potius nos in maeroribus suis quam convivas in prosperis noverint (Christiani).

On invitations :

Numquam petentes raro accipiamus rogati.

Facile contemnitur clericus, qui saepe vocatus ad prandium non recusat.

On almsgiving :

Optimus dispensator est, qui sibi nihil reservat.

CORRESPONDENCE

SIGN OF THE CROSS

(CLERGY REVIEW, 1942, XXII, p. 278)

The Rev. N. S. Rathbone writes :

I note that in the June issue of the CLERGY REVIEW a correspondent raises the question of the "doctrinal soundness" of the formula "In the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost". Your commentator remarks that this "truncated formula"—omitting the conjunction—is patient of a Sabellian interpretation.

It is perhaps worthy of observation that a somewhat similar point is raised in discussions of the heresy of Priscillian, himself accused of Patripassian tendencies. Orosius in his *Commonitorium ad Augustinum* states that he omitted "et" in his baptismal formula. ("Trinitatem autem solo verbo loquebatur, nam unionem absque ulla existentia aut proprietate adserens, sublato et, Patrem Filium et Spiritum sanctum hunc esse unum Christum docebat." Migne, P. L. 31, 1214.)

Tixeront (*Hist. des Dogmes*, II, 240) says "nous voyons Priscillien condamner le patripassianisme, et sa formule baptismale n'omet nullement, entre les noms des personnes divines, le mot et, comme Orose le prétend". A. E. Burn, however (*Intro. to the Creeds*, p. 143), regards Orosius' accusation as substantially if not literally true of the doctrine of the Bishop of Avila.

Unfortunately I have no other authorities immediately accessible, but perhaps this may serve as a footnote to your comment.

CO-OPERATION WITH NON-CATHOLICS

(CLERGY REVIEW, 1942, XXII, pp. 79, 165, n. 1, 239)

Dr. Butterfield writes :

Canon Mahoney holds that "the co-operation recommended by the Holy See is limited to social reconstruction": "One is forced to admire the prudence and discretion of the Holy See in limiting the plea for co-operation to social reconstruction." "Collaboration with non-Catholics is desired by the Holy See . . . purely within the sphere of the natural law."

The papal documents to which he refers in support of this view (*Sertum Laetitiae*, Vth Peace Point, Papal Allocution, Christmas Eve, 1941) are all concerned with fundamental errors of the natural order, and call for co-operation with non-Catholics in the uprooting of such errors. Clearly, then, the co-operation here recommended is in the sphere of the natural order. But neither these documents nor any other, that I know of, limit lawful co-operation exclusively to the natural law: they do not say that their recommendations are to be understood *sensu negante et exclusivo*, forbidding any but co-operation in the natural sphere. On the contrary, to my mind, the trend of papal pronouncement seems rather to extend co-operation beyond the confines of the purely natural order. *Singulari Quadam* urges co-operation for the "general welfare", for "any morally permissible advantage". Christian things are surely included in the "general welfare", are "morally permissible advantages". It would seem, then, that there is neither rational nor documentary support for the view which holds, hints, or implies that the Church has forbidden all co-operation except within the sphere of the

natural law. The Church leaves us free to co-operate for any suitable good object under the guidance and supervision of our bishops.

Canon Mahoney thinks that it will be found, on examination, that many of my suggestions for Christian co-operation are, as a matter of fact, well within the natural law. It is certainly true that they do not contradict the natural law, and in this sense may be said to be well within it. But the Christian revelation, with its implications and consequences, goes far beyond and above the natural law. Now I submit that most of the suggestions in my article were Christian in this full sense. For instance, reverence for Christ, for the Bible, for the Cross; respect and honour for the Trinity, for the Apostles' Creed, the observance of Sunday rest and of the great Christian Feasts, public recognition of Catholicism by the State, etc. All these are Christian things, not revealed in the natural law. I suggested them as lawful objects for co-operation. Canon Mahoney, I think, agrees that they are lawful objects for co-operation, but because he wishes to limit lawful co-operation to the natural law, he tries to prove that they are not Christian things, that they are of the natural order, that they "are well within the natural law". In vain. They are not mere natural things but of the revelation of Christ. Indeed, I suspect there is more Christianity in our Christian civilization than at first appears. For instance, Christian justice is not quite the same as natural justice: it is informed with Christianity. In the same way, Christian marriage, Christian education, the Christian conception of religion, Christian principles and virtues are not revealed by the natural law but are of Christian origin and nature. It cannot be assumed, but must be proved, that co-operation to promote these Christian things is unlawful.

But I drew the distinction: *quod licet non semper expedit*. Canon Mahoney suggests that it would be practical in this theological review to try to explore what is expedient. The theologian from his principles can often determine what is lawful, but what is expedient is often found only from prudent experiment, from trial and error, from a courageous testing in practice of the lawful possibilities. We learn to walk by trying to walk, not by arm-chair study and discussion. And I believe we shall learn best what is expedient and what is not expedient in co-operation by trying to co-operate. The most practical course is to follow the lead given by our Hierarchy, whose vigilance will safeguard us amid the dangers involved. Where it is possible to discuss for ever the expediency of this or that form of co-operation, guidance can only be sought from experience.

CHORAL SERVICES

(CLERGY REVIEW, 1942, XXII, p. 186)

In answer to an enquiry of a correspondent concerning the Choral Services recommended by W.P.S. in the April issue, the Manresa Press communicates the following:

The *Service for the Conversion of England* may be obtained from the Manresa Press, the price being 1s. 6d. net. The booklet *Choral Devotions to the Sacred Heart* is also published by the Manresa Press, the price being 1s. net, but it is at present out of print. A new reprint has been put in hand and will be ready in a few weeks' time.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM